The Role of Free Translation in Rendering the Collocational Phrases of the Quranic Text into English

Abdalati Mohamed Ali

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of PhD

Department of Theology and Religious Studies
Faculty of Humanities
The University of Chester
September 2019

Abstract

The following thesis presents an investigation into the problems of rendering the Arabic collocational phrases in the Quran into English. The research reveals that literal translation may sometimes deform the meaning of the collocations found in the source text, while free translation is able to convey a better sense of their implicit meaning.

The thesis studies three translations of the Quran – those of Muhammad Pickthall (1930), Abdullah Ali (1934) and Al-Hilali and Khan (1974) – and undertakes an in-depth comparison of their translations of a selection of collocations. It explores the advantages and disadvantages of the methods adopted by the translators with the aid of the Quranic exegeses of Al-Tabari (839-923 CE), Al-Razi (544-604 CE), Al-Qurtubi (1214-1273 CE), and Ibn Kathir (1300-1373), and relevant works by prominent Muslim theologians such as Al-Damaghany (1007-1085: 1983) and Ibn Al-Jawzy (510-597: 1987), as well as a number of established Arabic-English dictionaries, such as the *Arabic-English Dictionary of Quranic Usage* (DAEQU) (Abdel-Haleem and Badwi,2008), the *Dictionary of the Contemporary Arabic Language* (DCAL) (Omar,2008) ,and the *Lisān Al-Arab* (DLA) (Ibn Manzur,1955).

This research is the first of its kind to examine collocations in the Quran from the perspective of translation theory. It adopts the methodology of Peter Newmark's (1988) semantic and communicative translation theory and James Dickins' exegetic translation model (2002). The application of these theoretical approaches is intended to act as a guide for future translators of the Quran, particularly when faced with the problem of providing English translations of collocations that successfully convey the implicit meaning of the Arabic text. In addition, it recommends the use of some translation techniques suggested by Newmark (1995) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1958: 1995), such as paraphrases, footnotes, transpositions, cultural borrowing, additions, compensation and descriptive equivalents, which give the target readers a broader contextual knowledge and provide them with the tools they need to grasp the deeper meanings of these collocations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes on Transliteration

The following system of transliteration is used in this thesis:

The Alphabet:

ء	'	ض	ḍ
ب	B	ط	ṭ
ت	T	ظ	ẓ
ث	Th	ع	‘
ج	J	غ	gh
ح	ḥ	ف	f
خ	Kh	ق	q
د	D	ك	k
ذ	Dh	ل	l
ر	R	م	m
ز	Z	ن	n
س	S	ه	h
ش	Sh	و	w
ص	ṣ	ي	y

Vowels:

Short	Fatḥah	a	Ḍammah	u	Kasrah	i
Long		ā		ū		ī

This transliteration system applies to all the Arabic words transliterated in this thesis except the names of authors with Arabic names as some of them provide their own spelling of their

names in English which may not confirm to this transliteration system. Accordingly, a name like ‘Abdel-Haleem’ is not transliterated as ‘Abdel-Halīm’.This transliteration system also includes the three short and the three long vowels in Arabic which are represented in English as /a/, /i/, /u/ and /ā/, /ī/, /ū/ respectively.

List of Abbreviations

AACD	*Al-Hafiz Arabic Collocation Dictionary*
DAEQU	*Dictionary of Arabic-English Quranic Usage*
DCAL	*Dictionary of Contemporary Arabic Language*
DEDC	*Dar El-Ilm's Dictionary of Collocation*
DLA	*Dictionary of Lisan Al-Arab*
MSA	Modern Standard Arabic
RL	Receptal Language
SL	Source Language
ST	Source Text

Acknowledgements

All praise and thanks are due, above all, to Allah, for giving me the inspiration, intention and ability to produce this work. If Allah had not helped me, I would not have been able to achieve the writing of this thesis. “And my success cannot come except from Allah, in Him I trust and unto Him I turn” (Hūd: 88).

I would like to extend my deepest thanks and gratitude to my supervisors. Prof. Oliver Scharbrodt’s guidance, his invaluable comments and excellent advice as well as his constructive feedback helped steer me in the right direction. His useful detailed discussions have been of great benefit in helping me produce a rigorous academic work. I also wish to thank Dr. Caroline Tee for her tremendous support and encouragement.

My special thanks should also go to the head of the department of theology and religious studies, Prof. Wayne Morris, and to all members of staff in the department at the University of Chester who helped and supported me in times of distress and frustration.

I am deeply grateful to the staff of Brotherton library at the University of Leeds for their help and cooperation as well as for their resilience – they treated me as one of the staff throughout all these years of research.

I owe special thanks to the Libyan government for granting me a scholarship to complete a PhD programme. I would also like to thank my friends and colleagues in the UK and in Libya for their support.

Finally, I could never have completed this research without the support and the encouragement of my family. My deepest appreciation goes to my father and mother, sisters and brothers who were always calling from Tripoli, encouraging me and trying their best to raise my morale and create a suitable atmosphere for me until I finished my work. Words are not enough to express my thanks and gratitude to my wife together with my little cute daughter, Bushra, for her patience and for enduring with me the stress during the years of research, and for encouraging me, as well as for making *duʿa* for me in every single prayer. Thank you, Nowara, for being with me during thick and thin.

Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is entirely the result of my own work and has not been previously submitted for any other degree at the University of Chester or any other university. Some of the ideas of this thesis have been expanded in three papers, one was published in the proceedings of the 16th Malay International Conference in 2017 and other two will be published in *Translatologia* (issue 1/2020), and in the proceedings of the 6th Conference on Translating the Meanings of the Quran which will be held in Marrakech, Morrocco, on 2nd February 2020.

Chapter One
Introduction

1.1 Background to the research

The Quran needs to be interpreted and translated into other languages, including English, if non-Arabic speakers are to understand the words of Allah that are enshrined in the text that lies at the heart of the Islamic faith. As Muhammad Abdel-Haleem states:

> The Quran is the supreme authority in Islam. It is the fundamental and paramount source of the creed, rituals, ethics, and laws of the Islamic religion. It is the book that differentiates between right and wrong, so that nowadays, when the Muslim world is dealing with such universal issues as globalization, the environment, combating terrorism and drugs, issues of medical ethics, and feminism, evidence to support the various arguments is sought in the Quran. (Muhammad Abdel-Haleem, 2004, ix)

Taqi ad-Din Ibn Taimiya (2001) stated in his *fatwas* that our spoken and written words are the means by which we understand one another; however, he declares, it is of far greater importance to grasp the meaning conveyed by the words of the Quran.

Rendering the meaning of the Quran into English is, therefore, an essential task, but it represents an especially difficult one due to the unique linguistic, semantic and cultural features inherent to all sacred texts. As Andrew Chesterman explains:

> [I]f you believe that the scriptures are indeed the Word of God, and if you believe that you have a mission to spread this Word, you quickly find yourself in a quandary. The Word is holy; how then can it be changed? For translation does not only substitute one word-meaning for another but also reconstructs the structural form in which these word-meanings are embedded. (Andrew Chesterman, 1997, 21)

Since many of the words used in the Quran include metaphorical and cultural expressions, a word-for-word or literal translation risks distorting their meaning. However, this thesis argues that if the translator attempts a free translation, including the use of idiomatic expressions and changing the grammatical and lexical forms of the Arabic text, they may be able to offer a closer approximation of its meaning to a non-Arabic-speaking readership. A free translation is a more flexible skill that is generally used to convey the meaning and spirit of the original without attempting to copy sentences patterns of the source language. This approach includes

various forms of strategies such as paraphrase, footnotes, explanatory note, shifting, descriptive and functional equivalence, and cultural borrowing followed by explanation. Newmark (1995:40-41) asserts that free translation 'usually it is a paraphrase much longer than the original…often prolix and pretentious'. Basil Hatim and Jeremy Munday (2004) observe that literal translation acts to render word for word translation which may occure between two closely related languguages, but free translation attempts to carry the core meaning of the source text. Therefore, Arabic language differs from English language to adopt literal translation and moreover the Arabic of the Quran is unique. For example, if the Quranic collocation 'umma al-Qura (6:92)' is literally translated, it would be 'mother of villages'. This literal translation may confuse target reader because it follows the form of the source text, but doesnot convey the implicit meaning of the collocation. Conversely free translation is able to produce an informative translation and uses a parenthical note as (Makkah). According to Abdel Raof, cited in Mohammed Abdelwali (2007, 2),'Quranic discourse is a linguistic scenery characterized by a rainbow of syntactic, semantic, rhetorical, phonetic and cultural features that are distinct from other types of Arabic prose'. Abdelwali adds that 'most of these features are alien to the linguistic norms of other languages'. Translators, therefore, face great difficulties in rendering the meaning of the Quran into other languages because of the complex nature of its discourse, and its prototypical linguistic and rhetorical features. Peter Newmark (1998, 120) adds another dimension to the problem faced by translators when he states that 'even in a "sacred" text, you may have to translate, not just what the writer means rather than what he writes, but even what you think he means'. In fact, translating the meaning of the Quran demands an advanced knowledge of the syntax of the Arabic language, as well as an acquaintance with the best exegetical sources and with the reasons for the revelations contained in the Quran's verses and surahs (chapters). Translators need to be aware of other relevant materials which address the narration of the *ḥadīths* or sayings of the Prophet Mohammed, such as the works of Bukhari and Muslim, as these can also help them convey the message contained in the hadiths appropriately. Moreover, the Quran is an independent genre: it is written in classical Arabic, which is very different from modern standard Arabic (MSA). In classical Arabic, words contain numerous shades of meaning, depending on the context in which they are used. For example, as some Quranic collocations include cultural connotations, translators often struggle to grasp their implicit meaning, and as a consequence, tend to fall back on a literal method of translation. This often leads to ambiguity and confusion as a literal rendition does not take into consideration the collocation's allegorical sense.

A collocation can be defined as two or three words that usually occur together to produce a specific meaning. Mona Baker (1992, 14) enlarges on this description when she states that collocations are 'semantically arbitrary restrictions which do not follow logically from the propositional meaning of a word'. Indeed, as Frank R. Palmer (1981, 76-77) shows, collocations are not subject to strict rules; they are not simply 'an association of ideas' but are idiosyncratic, and their meaning cannot necessarily be deduced from the meanings of the associated words. Palmer illustrates his point with Porzig's example (1933) , noting that in English the adjective 'blond' is highly restricted in its distribution – it is associated only with 'hair' and cannot be used with other nouns. Some English and Arabic linguists offer different views on the form that collocations take. The term 'collocation' refers, in both Arabic and English, to the habitual co-occurrence of lexical items and these combinations represent a specific type of syntagmatic lexical relation, but although there are a number of similarities between Arabic and English collocations – for example, in both languages, there are many restricted collocations, and sometimes an equivalent collocation does exist in the other language – there are also many differences. These can pose difficulties for translators working between Arabic and English as lexemes differ in the ways in which they can be combined: items that collocate in the source language may not operate the same way in the target language. As Baker (1992, 54) points out, 'differences in the collocational patterning of the source and target languages create potential pitfalls and can pose various problems in translation'.

1.1.1 Aims of the research

Despite the fact that translation studies – which developed as a discipline during the second half of the twentieth century – has contributed much to the debates over how to bridge the linguistic and cultural gaps between languages, there has been only limited research into the translation of collocations. Nevertheless, it is recognised that there is a need for descriptive studies in this area, including the use of case studies to explore the broader theoretical issues that emerge when examining the problems of translating collocations. This thesis offers such a study.

The first aim of this study, therefore, is to investigate the problems that translators face when attempting to render culturally specific collocational patterns that occur in the text of the Quran (including noun + noun; verb + noun; noun + adjective; noun + preposition + noun; preposition + noun + noun; and adjective + adjective collocations) into English. The

second aim is test the proposition that, in general, free translation best conveys the intended meaning of Quranic collocations due to the fact that it focuses on their contextual meaning and approximates the message in the target language, whereas literal translation fails to pay attention to the content of the source language and thus risks distorting the implicit meaning of such collocations, causing ambiguity and confusing its target readers. The third aim of this research is to provide a guide for future translators of the Quran, particularly when translating Quranic collocations into English.

In summary, the overall objective of the present study is to address the issues associated with rendering culturally specific collocations in the Quran into English and to provide practical guidance to future translators.

1.1.2 Research questions

According to Bob Mathew and Liz Rose (2010), there are four different types of research question: the first, the explorative research question, seeks to explore a particular phenomenon; the second relates to descriptive research, the purpose of which is to describe a phenomenon in detail; the third, the explanatory research question, examines the causes and effects of a phenomenon in order to raise the 'why? question', and the last type is the evaluative research question, which assesses the specific methods of a phenomenon and aims to develop and improve the treatment of a particular issue. This latter type of research usually analyses such issues as the effectiveness of the phenomenon.

Based on the above description, this thesis addresses four evaluative research questions:

- Which translation methods and procedures can be used to obtain informative and effective translations of Quranic collocations?
- How effective is the free translation method in contextualising the culturally specific collocations in the Quranic text?
- What is the impact of adopting a literal translation method on the translation of culturally specific collocations in the Quran?
- How useful are works of Quranic exegesis to translators when rendering the collocations found in the Quran into English?

In its quest to discover the optimum way of producing informative and appropriate translations of culturally specific Quranic collocations, the research first explores communicative, semantic and exegetical translation methods. It investigates whether these free-translation approaches, which reproduce the content without the form, allows the implicit meaning of the collocations to be contextualised. It then investigates the literal translation of culturally specific collocations to ascertain whether its proposition that this type of translation deforms the implicit meaning and risks causing ambiguity and confusion is justified. This proposition follows Newmark's (1995) observation that collocations present translators with various difficulties and, as such, literal translation potentially distorts their cultural meaning; instead, an effective translation may require the translator to find descriptive functional equivalents. The exegetical books used in this study, which elucidate and clarify the underlying meanings of Quranic collocations, are particularly helpful in identifying the advantages and disadvantages of the different methods of translation.

1.1.3 Research methodology

This study undertakes a comparative analysis of different English translations of a number of Quranic collocations. The analysis takes place in a framework provided by translation theory, meaning that it explores the advantages and disadvantages of free translation versus literal translation of Quranic collocations, exemplified by the selected translations, from a theoretical perspective.

Three English translations of the Quran (Muhammed Pickthall, 1930; Abdullah Y.Ali, 1934; and Muhammed Al-Hilali and Muhsin Khan, 1974) have been selected to form the corpus for the comparative analysis of the translation of a selection of collocations. The data has been collected from different chapters of the Quran. In addition, the study has consulted four classical exegetical works by Abu Ja'far Al-Tabari (1997), Fakhr Al-Din Al-Razi (1995), Muhammad Al-Qurtubi (2006), and Imad Ad-Din Ibn Kathir (1997), as well as relevant works by some prominent Muslim theologians, such as *Al-Wujūh wa al-naẓāʾir li alfāẓ kitāb Allāh al-ᶜazīz* by Al-Hussein Al-Damaghany (1983) and *Nuzhat al-aᶜyun al-nawāẓir fī ᶜilm al-wujūh wa al-naẓāʾir* by Abdel-Rahman Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987). It is also important to mention here that three dictionaries form part of the backbone of this research: the *Arabic-English Dictionary of Quranic Usage* (DAEQU) (Abdel-Haleem and El-Said Badwi, 2008), the *Dictionary of the Contemporary Arabic Language* (DCAL) (Ahmed Omar, 2008), and the *Lisān Al-Arab* (DLA) (literally, *The Tongue of Arabs*) by Muhammed Ibn

Manzur (1955). A review of the relevant literature on the subject suggests that there is a lack of information on collocation in Arabic dictionaries, and students seem unfamiliar with this semantic phenomenon. Peter Emery (1991), for example, criticises classical Arabic dictionaries, claiming they are unsystematic, and points to the need for descriptive studies focusing on the different registers of MSA, with particular attention to collocational usage. The same issue applies to Quranic Arabic dictionaries, as such, there is a pressing need to establish contemporary encyclopedia which elucidate cultural-specific meanings particularly collocations.

Indeed, more recently, Bader Dwiek and Mariam Abu Shakra (2011) conducted a further empirical study focusing on the translation of semantic and lexical contextualised collocations found in three religious texts – namely, the Quran, the Hadiths and the Bible – by postgraduate translation students in three different Jordanian universities. The results reveal that the students were unfamiliar with most collocational patterns in the source languages of both the Quran and the Bible. These unsatisfactory results were compounded by the lack of monolingual or bilingual dictionaries dealing with collocations in general and with collocations in religious texts in particular. The above empirical studies show the need to conduct a more theoretical analysis that can suggest answers to some of the problems their findings have highlighted.

The study's theoretical approach, therefore, integrates Newmark's semantic and communicative translation theory (1988) with the exegetic translation method advanced by James Dickins et al. (2002). According to Newmark (1988), semantic translation focuses on the intentions of the author and uses as many words in the target language as are needed to convey the necessary information from the source language. This approach goes inside the original text and clarifies its pragmatic and intended meanings. Communicative translation, on the other hand, focuses on the message and concentrates on the reader, transferring the effect of the words from the source to the target language by means of approximation. Thus, semantic translation is an attempt to interpret the source text, allowing the translator more freedom than a communicative translation. Newmark, however, argues that the semantic and communicative approaches must be considered together, suggesting that both methods should be applied when translating a text. Dickins et al. (2002), meanwhile, believe the exegetical translation method can be used to reduce the loss of meaning that occurs when translating the source language into the target language by explicating and clarifying culturally specific words and approximating their meaning in the target language. For example, informative

footnotes can provide the sort of background information that may be necessary if the non-Arabic reader is to comprehend some of the cultural references in the Quran that may otherwise appear obscure. The exegetical translation method represents a type of 'compensation' for the loss of meaning that can accompany translation, and one or another of its many forms is essential for the production of an acceptable translation. This study, therefore, adopts a theoretical approach that merges these two translation models in its investigation of the proposition that free translation is the more successful in overcoming the difficulties that translators face when attempting to render the collocations found in the Quran into English.

1.1.4 Significance of the research

To date, there have been very few theoretical or empirical studies that focus on the translation of collocations, and on collocations in the Quran in particular. However, extrapolating from the small sample of examples studied here, it could be argued that the deformation of the implicit meaning of such collocations is likely to be relatively widespread in translations of the Quran. With this in mind, the present research is significant in that it is the first of its kind to examine collocations in the Quranic text from the perspective of translation theory. It is anticipated that it will provide researchers and translators with an insight into the most useful methods to apply when translating such collocations. Moreover, it paves the way for further research into the analysis and revision of the translations of cultural expressions in the Quran by previous translators. In addition, the study will help both academic and non-academic readers understand the cultural dimensions of the collocations in the Quranic text.

So far, this chapter has provided an introduction to the thesis. In order to clarify the conceptual underpinning of the research, the following section discusses the concept of translation, the different types of translation, collocation as a semantic notion, and the problems associated with translating collocations in general, and Quranic collocations in particular.

1.1.5 The concept of translation

This section will discuss some of the many definitions of translation. According to Eugene Nida and Charles Taber (2003, 12), 'translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the SL [source language] message, first in terms of

meaning and second in terms of style'. The translator needs to be familiar not only with both languages but also with their cultural dimensions in order to transfer the meaning of the source language accurately into the target language. Susan Bassnett (1980, 2; 2002, 11) maintains that 'translation involves the rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) so as to ensure that (1) the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and (2) the structures of the SL will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the TL structures will be seriously distorted'. Therefore, the translator should in most cases avoid a total match of meaning and style because that will lead to an inappropriate translation: there are often dissimilarities between languages and a satisfactory translation can only be achieved by approximation to the source text. As Abdul-Raof (2001, 7) notes, 'a translator who aspires to achieve total lexical and/or textual equivalence is chasing a mirage: total equivalence at any level of language is impossible, relative equivalence at any level is possible'. However, Baker (2011) warns that, due to the many differences between linguistic systems, a certain amount of loss of, addition to, or skewing of the meaning of the original text is often inevitable; accuracy in translation is important but it is equally as important to reproduce the text in a common target language that is familiar to its readers, keeping the channels of communication open. The consensus appears to be that the main goal of translation is to convey the meaning of the source language into the target language, and meaning should therefore take priority over structure.

Etien Dolet (1540: 1997, cited in Jeremy Munday, 2012) identifies five principal ways of translating appropriately from one language into another. Firstly, translators must clearly understand the sense intended by the original author and should feel free to clarify obscurity. Secondly, they should have full knowledge of both the source and target languages so as avoid diminishing the beauty of the writing. Thirdly, they should avoid word-for-word renderings and, fourthly, unusual forms. Finally, they should assemble and align words in an articulate manner.

Basil Hatim and Ian Mason (1990, 12) point out that 'translation is a matter of choice, but choice is always motivated: omission, additions and alterations may indeed be justified but only in relation to intended meaning'. It can be argued that collocations include implicit meanings, and the translator will only be able to effectively transfer the intended meaning if they adopt a method of free translation. That is to say, the translator has to use their own words without restriction, sometimes adjusting the original text and sometimes adding information to simplify its meaning for the target reader through the use of translation

techniques such as paraphrasing, footnotes or descriptive equivalence for the purpose of illustration.

Newmark (1995, 5) concurs: he sees translation as 'rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text'. In other words, translators need to be aware of the author's intention and should transfer this intention into the target language. In addition, they need subject-specific knowledge to be able to transfer the terminologies accurately and clearly, as well as a working knowledge of translation theories in order to know what to do, when and why. In this regard, Chesterman (2000a, 3, cited in Jenny William, 2013, 13) also asserts that 'a translator must have a theory of translation: To translate without a theory is to translate blind'. He goes on to argue that 'theoretical concepts can be essential tools for thought and decision-making during the translation process'. Newmark (1995, 9) defines translation theory as the body of knowledge that has accrued over time about the process of translation, and maintains that it comprises four elements: firstly, identifying and defining translation problems (since without such problems there would be no translation theory); secondly, referring to all those factors that must be considered in solving the problem; thirdly, listing all the possible translation procedures; and finally, recommending the most suitable of these, plus the appropriate translation.

In Mildred Larson's (1998, 3) opinion, translation 'consists of studying the lexicon, grammatical structure, communication situation and cultural context of the source language text, analysing it in order to determine its meaning, and then reconstructing this same meaning using the lexicon and grammatical structure which are appropriate in the receptor language and its cultural context'. In rendering the source text into target text, the translator needs to not only sometimes reproduce the same meaning using different linguistic elements but also to consider the nature of the target audience. As such, Newmark (1995) confirms that the translator has to study the source text not for itself alone but in the awareness that is has to be reproduced for different readers in a different culture. He identifies three types of reader, whom he labels as 'expert', 'educated' and 'uninformed'. An expert reader is a professional with expertise in the field who can distinguish between a good and a bad translation; an informed reader has a background knowledge of the topic; while the uninformed reader possesses no background knowledge at all. Thus, if the source text is the Quran, then translator should include even the third type of reader in their potential target audience because an English translation of the Quran will not only be used by academics and Muslims but, more importantly, by non-Muslims, who are generally unaware of the cultural concepts

and metaphorical meanings found in the Quran. The translator needs to transfer these meanings coherently in one way or another.

1.1.6 Types of translation

Translation theorists have chosen to categorise translation in different ways. According to Munday (2012), John Dryden (1631-1700), the seventeenth-century English poet, playwright and translator, proposed three models of translation. The first, *metaphrase*, refers to word-for-word and line-by-line translation; the second, *paraphrase*, entails changing whole phrases and more or less corresponds to faithful or sense-for-sense translation; while the third model, *imitation*, might be understood as adaptation. Dryden criticised those translators who adopted a metaphase model, producing literal translations; instead, he recommended the paraphrase model.

Meanwhile, Roman Jakobson (1959), cited in Lawrence Venuti (2012, 127), states that translation can be classified as three types. The first is *intraligual translation* or rewording, which entails a purely monolingual process – that is, an interpretation of verbal signs that are then replaced by other signs in the same language. The second is *interlingual translation* – that is, an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs in another language. The third type of translation is *intersemiotic translation* – that is, a translation from one linguistic system to another, meaning from a verbal to a nonverbal system. John C. Catford (1965), however, limits his classification of translation to two types, which he refers to as *total* and *restricted* translations. The former tends to replace source language grammar and lexis by the equivalent target-language grammar and lexis, with substantial replacement of source-language phonology/graphology by target-language phonology/graphology. In the case of restricted translation, however, source-language textual material tends to be replaced by equivalent target-language textual material at only one level: in other words, translation is performed only at the phonological or graphological level, or at only one of the two levels of grammar and lexis. Nida (1964), working at the same time as Catford, also offers two models of translation: *formal equivalence* focuses on the message itself, both its form and content, by matching the source language as closely as possible to the receptor language, whereas *dynamic equivalence* is based on the principle of equivalent effect, in which the message and content should be the same in both languages, aiming at a complete naturalness of expression. A later scholar, Larson (1998), distinguishes between *literal* and *idiomatic* types of translation. The former is form-based and tends to reproduce the linguistic features of the

source language. For Larson, this type of translation has little communication value, in contrast with idiomatic translation, which is meaning-based – that is, it is focuses on the meaning conveyed by the text.

John Beekman and John Callow's (1974) typology, however, identifies four categories of translation. The first of these, *highly literal translation*, tends to reproduce the source language linguistic features extremely closely. This type of translation can be useful in terms of showing the structure of the original text but it is of little communicative value to the target-language readers. The second type these authors refer to is *modified literal translation*, and they note that this can be adopted to improve and correct highly literal translations. When the meaning in the target language deviates from that of the original text, the translator needs to adjust and modify the lexical and grammatical aspects of the target language. In *idiomatic translation*, the third of these types, the meaning of the source language is transferred by using the natural linguistic form of the target language. In this case, the meaning does not emerge from the grammatical structures, or its lexical choices and combinations, but from the situation of the source language. Finally, the main purpose of *unduly free translation*, the fourth type, is to convey the message of the source language as clearly as possible in the target language. However, in this approach, the style of the original is changed significantly, rendering it unacceptable, as it neither attempts to reproduce the linguistic form of the source language nor convey the original content, nor therefore fails to successfully transfer the meaning of the original text into the target language.

Newmark (1995), meanwhile, proposes eight types of translations, beginning with *word-for-word* and *interlinear* translation. Word-for-word translation involves rendering both common and culturally specific words literally, 'out of context', the main intention being to preserve the word order of the source language. In the case of *interlinear* translation, however, the aim is to reproduce a target-language equivalent that is closest to the source language grammatical constructions of the original text. Newmark's third type, *faithful translation*, aims to reproduce the accurate contextual meaning of the original, and it maintains the same degree of grammatical and lexical abnormality in the translation as is found in the source text. It also emphasises faithfulness in conveying the intentions of the writer. Faithful translation can be distinguished from *semantic translation* in that the former avoids compromising the meaning while the latter accepts a degree of compromise, where appropriate, to ensure there is no assonance or repetition in the finished version. Semantic translation is the more flexible, as it allows for the translator's intuitive empathy with the original source text. The freest form

of translation, which is often used for plays and poetry, is *adaptation*. This is used when the effect of the source language's cultural background needs to be transplanted into a target-language culture while maintaining, for example, the plots, themes and characters of the original text. Linked to this is *free translation*, which reproduces content without form or matter without manner. This is meaning-based translation and it often uses paraphrasing to convey the meaning of the original. Newmark's seventh type, *idiomatic translation*, aims to reproduce the message of the original but deforms the nuances of meaning it contains by using expressions and idioms that are not present in the source language. Finally, *communicative translation* attempts to render the same contextual meaning as the original in such a way that the content and language can be clearly understood by the target readers. However, Newmark maintains that communicative translation does not allow as much freedom as semantic translation.

When viewing all the various characterisations of translation briefly mentioned above, it is noticeable that similar types of translation are often classified differently, according to the different translation theorists, but that most of these theorists refer to literal and free translation methods, although they tend to call them by different names. Although Beekman and Callow (1974) assert that literal translation is helpful in that it introduces the structure of the source text, both Dryden (in the seventeenth century) and Larson (1998) criticise this method as it does not fully convey the message of the source language to the target audience. Indeed, as Newmark (1995) suggests, it is free translation that arguably offers the most effective method, and therefore this approach can be used in translating the Quran, as it entails analysing and explaining the pragmatic and cultural meanings of the verses. In other words, the translator reads the source text and understands and produces the same meaning in the target language with different words and word order making the message sound natural for the target audience. The translator sometimes uses some strategies with free translation to make the message accessable and intelligible such as footnote, parenthetical note, explanatory note, shifting, and descriptive and functional equivalence. In addition, the semantic and communicative approaches also proposed by Newmark can be applied together to produce a sensitive and intelligible rendering the Quran in the target language, since both methods convey the thoughts of the author and decode the various components of figurative language, such as idioms, metaphors, collocations, anatomy, metonymy and polysemy, as well as culturally specific terminology.

1.1.7 Collocation as a semantic notion

'Collocation' is the term for two or three words that are usually used together to reproduce a specific meaning. It was originally introduced by John R. Firth (1957, 196) to describe 'an abstraction at the syntagmatic level [that] is not directly related to the conceptual approach of the meaning of words'. Larson (1998, 159) defines collocation as 'words joined together in phrases or sentences to form semantically unified expression', while Sabine Bartsch (2004, 76) describes it as 'lexically and/or pragmatically constrained recurrent co-occurrences of at least two lexical items which are in a direct syntactic relation with each other'. In other words, collocation represents a fixed relationship between two or three words with a metaphorical meaning. These lexical items are arbitrarily combined and do not follow a narrow set of rules. For Anthony Cowie (1981, 224), a collocation is 'a composite unit which permits the substitutability of items for at least one of its constituent elements'. This basically means that when translating a collocation, one of its components can be rendered literally but the other generally includes an implicit meaning; hence, the translator needs to grasp the connotative meaning of the whole phrase. For example, the English collocation 'deep depression' consists of the combination of a component with a literal meaning, the noun 'depression', with a component, the adjective 'deep', which conveys the figurative meaning of 'severe'.

1.1.7.1 The problems of translating collocations

Translators may struggle to recognise collocations when they appear in the original text or find it difficult to grasp their intended meaning, particularly as linguistic items that naturally collocate in the source language may not collocate in the same way in the target language. According to Baker (2011), collocational patterns often carry meanings that are culturally specific and she advises translators to avoid following source language patterns that are untypical of the target language unless there is a good reason for doing so. Baker (1992, 60) also contends that 'translation of culture-specific collocations involves a partial increase in information. This is unavoidable in as much as unfamiliar associations of ideas cannot simply be introduced in a target text without giving the reader some hint as to how to interpret them.' For example, the English cultural collocation 'hen party' would sound unnatural to most Arabic readers because the concept refers to a custom that is not a part of their culture. Thus, the translator needs to clarify the collocation by adding a paraphrase or an explanatory note, such as 'an all-female event that takes place before a woman is due to be married'.

The difficulties of translation are increased when there are cultural gaps between the two languages. Paul Kussmaul (1995,65) notes that 'cultural problems most often arise when there is a great distance between source and target cultures […] Thus the meanings of metaphors and symbols may create problems.' The more differences there are between two language families, the more problematic the translation process. This is particularly the case with translations from Arabic into English (and vice versa): Arabic is classified as a Semitic language while English is part of the Germanic group of languages, and this means they share few grammatical and semantic similarities. Baker (2018, 55) provides examples which serve to demonstrate the differences in the collocational patterning found in English and Arabic. For instance, she explains that while the English verb 'deliver' collocates with a number of nouns, Arabic uses a different verb for each of these nouns. Thus, the English collocation 'to deliver a speech' would become '*yulqī khiṭāban*'; 'to deliver news' would translate as '*yanqilu ʾakhbāran*'; and 'to deliver a baby' would be '*yuwallidu ʾimraʾatan*' (literally, 'to help a woman in childbirth'). She argues that the latter phrase in Arabic places the focus on the woman whereas in English the stress is on the baby. Baker further observes that the common English collocation 'law and order' reflects the value that English-speaking cultures place on order while the equivalent Arabic collocation '*alqānūn wat-taqalīd*' ('law and convention/tradition') emphasises the respect that Arab cultures accord tradition.

The differences between collocations in Arabic and English, therefore, often pose difficulties for translators trying to grasp their intended meaning. Frank Smadja et al. (1996) suggest two main reasons why it is difficult to render collocations faithfully in the other language: Firstly, they are ambiguous structures that are difficult to understand and their meaning are often deduced from the two collocants combined togather, and therefore these cannot be rendered on word for word basis. Secondly, collocations are realm-dependent particularly some of which related to specific subjects which are different from the general ones. Newmark (1995) adds another dimension to the problem of translating collocations, referring to the fact that collocation moves from a normal to a specific meaning, and thus for standardised terms that include figurative images, such as metaphorical and culturally specific collocations, literal translations are usually unworkable. For example, the word 'white' in English has a normal descriptive meaning when used in a phrase like 'white paint', but when it is paired with some specific nouns like 'elephant', for example, its meaning changes entirely and it must be understood as forming part of a collocation that is used to refer to something useless or troublesome. Collocations, therefore, are a particularly

problematic area for translators: lexemes differ in their collocability from one language to another; the constituent elements of collocations often acquire a more specific, restricted meaning; and collocations may also be used to refer to culturally specific items and concepts. Because of the cultural differences between Arabic-speaking and English-speaking cultures, translators may have to clarify the meaning by shifting to the use of other techniques, such as adding a footnote, an explanatory phrase, a paraphrase or a descriptive equivalent.

1.1.7.2 Previous studies on the translation of collocations

There have only been a few empirical studies dedicated to the subject of translating collocations from Arabic to English, or vice versa. Showqi Bahumaid (2006), Riyadh Hussein (1997), Fanit Rabeh (2010) and Nafez Shammas (2013), for example, have studied the work of Arab students and teachers of English, and the sum of their results reveals that not only the students but also the teachers struggled to recognise the meanings of collocations and therefore tended to adopt a literal form of translation, which was usually unsuccessful in conveying the intentions of the author.

Translators generally have recourse to dictionaries to assist them in their work. However, the assessments of Arabic dictionaries, as well as Arabic-English and English-Arabic collocational dictionaries, by Emery (1991), Khalil Nofal (2012) and Mohamed Ghalal (2015) reveal that classical Arabic dictionaries tend to be unsystematic and collocational dictionaries appear to omit much important material. These authors agree there is an urgent need for the production of better dictionaries. This is confirmed by Bahumaid's (2006) empirical study of the translation of collocations from English to Arabic, and vice versa (mentioned above). He selected four Arab university instructors to take part in a translation test that consisted of thirty sentences containing contextualised collocations: fifteen were to be translated from English to Arabic and another fifteen from Arabic to English. The instructors were allowed to use all the resources available to them and were given ample time to perform the task. However, the findings of this experiment show that the results of the translators' performances were poor. Bahumaid discovered that one of the major causes of their unsatisfactory performance was the fact that none of the English collocations included in their test appeared in either of the two English-Arabic dictionaries that are most widely used by Arabic speakers – namely, the *Al-Mawrid English-Arabic Dictionary* (2002) and the *Elias Modern English-Arabic Dictionary* (1993) – although they are included in some monolingual English dictionaries such as the *BBI Dictionary of English*

Word Combinations (1997) and the *Longman Language Activator* (1993). Likewise, most of the Arabic collocations are not included in Arabic-English dictionaries such as *Wehr's Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic* (1979) and the *A-lMawrid Arabic-English Dictionary* (1993), while their English equivalents can only be found in monolingual dictionaries.

Among the other difficulties faced by the translators in this test was the fact that collocations tend to be culturally specific. Bahumaid (2006, 39) gives the example of the phrase '*al-khulafā ar-rāshidūn*', which was rendered by one of the participants as 'orthodox caliphs' – the translation provided in the *Al-Mawrid Arabic-English Dictionary* and *Wehr's Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic*. Bahumaid criticises these dictionaries for their lack of accuracy since they do not convey the connotations of this Islamic phrase; a better rendition would be a descriptive statement such as 'the title given to the first four caliphs in Islam'. He also notes that the translators often failed because of the considerable variations in the collocability of lexical items found in the two languages, and that they found the rendering of Arabic collocations into English more difficult than translation in the opposite direction. Moreover, they tended to use synonyms or near-synonyms of collocations because they were not familiar with the equivalent target-language collocations, and sometimes they avoided rendition of the collocation altogether. In contrast, the literal collocations included in the test were correctly rendered by most participants as this type of collocation simply requires the literal translation method. Bahumaid observes that this empirical study examining the process of translating Arabic and English collocations is the first of its kind, and he concludes that the main reasons for the difficulties experienced by the translators was the lack of any proper training in handling collocations at translation schools in the Arab world, compounded by the lack of Arabic-English collocational dictionaries. He argues that it would be justified to call upon Arab institutions and colleges of translation to include a compulsory course on collocations, and recommends that Arab scholars pool their resources to fill the lexicographical gap in this important area.

Rabeh (2010), Hussein (1997) and Shammas (2013), cited in Jabak et al. (2016), have also conducted studies of Arab students. Rabeh (2010) carried out research for his Masters dissertation on the problems that students face in translating collocations from English into Arabic, and vice versa. His findings reveal that the students were challenged by the task and failed to successfully translate the collocations, the primary reason being that they mainly adopted a literal translation strategy and appeared unaware of the cultural meanings that the collocations possessed in the source language. Hussein (1997) has also conducted a study of

the translation of collocations by Arab students. His research reveals that the participating students struggled to translate English collocations correctly – the percentage of students who found an appropriate translation was only thirty-nine. Hussein's findings were similar to Rabeh's in that the students' difficulties were overwhelmingly due to their lack of awareness of the meanings of these collocations, which led them to attempt a literal translation. More recently, Shammas (2013) has carried out further research into the translation of collocations from Arabic into English, and vice versa, based around three questionaires he gave to Arab Masters students in universities in Jordan, Syria, Algeria and Lebanon. He used many types of collocation but mainly focused on adjective-noun collocations in order to limit the scope of his study. One sample question consists of examples of Arabic collocations that are rendered as four different English translations; the students were asked to choose the ones that best conveyed the original meaning. The study reveals that the students faced difficulties in translating the collocations appropriately, particularly when translating Arabic collocations into English. When asked about the methods they used to translate these collocations, their answers showed that they depended on two approaches: first, they adopted a literal translation strategy, then they substituted words according to their own speculation as to what the collocation might mean.

In the above-mentioned critical assessement of Arabic dictionaries, and Arabic-English and English-Arabic collocational dictionaries, Emery (1991) and Nofal (2012) note that Arabic is rich in lexical and derivational resources, and includes a great number of collocations. Thus, they argue the need for a monolingual modern standard Arabic (MSA) dictionary. They criticise classical Arabic dictionaries such as *Figh Al-lughah* and *Al-Mukhaṣṣaṣ* because, although they include a wealth of collocational information, they are unsystematic: the collocations are not alphabetically arranged and do not follow a logical order. Besides, much of this information is no longer relevant to MSA. Emery and Nofal state that there is a pressing need to conduct descriptive studies of MSA at different linguistic levels, paying particular attention to collocational usage, since MSA differs significantly from its classical precursor. In addition, they suggest that not only students and translators but also teachers of foreign languages should receive intensive training on how to use and teach the translation of collocations.

Ghalal (2015), meanwhile, presents a critical assessment of two recent dictionaries: namely, *Dar El-Ilm's Dictionary of Collocation* (DEDC) (English-Arabic) (2007) by Hasan Ghazala and *Al-Hafiz Arabic Collocation Dictionary* (AACD) (Arabic-English) (2004) by

Al-Tahir Al-Hafiz. Ghalal notes that English collocations in the DEDC were translated into free Arabic word combinations, disregarding available Arabic collocations that could add greater richness to the dictionary and render it of more use to its users. He also notes that the AACD suffers from a limited range of items for each entry and that it presents only a small range of the wide collocational possibilities in Arabic, ignoring the fact that Arabic, a lexically rich language, can provide a significant range of collocational material on different word entries. Ghalāl states that so much material has been omitted in the entries that foreign students of Arabic would find it extremely difficult to find the right collocation – one example he gives is that the derivatives of 'hope' are completely ignored as the Arabic equivalents of a verb + the noun (hope) or a noun + the verb (to hope) are not found, and only an adjective + the noun (hope) is included. He calls for more materials to be added to such dictionaries through the establishment of more comprehensive thesauri and corpuses, which could be produced by surveying newspapers and literary works, for example, and by consulting André Lefevere's (1993, 7) Arabic lexicographic work on contemporary collocations. Ghalal's assessment draws attention to the importance of producing better collocation dictionaries, as well as using Arabic's rich linguistic legacy to complement the deficiencies of the existing ones.

The overall conclusion that can be drawn from these studies is that the translation of Arabic collocations poses particular problems for Arab students and teachers, and may even cause problems for foreign learners of Arabic due to the paucity of information in dictionaries and the students' general lack of awareness of the meanings of collocations, which generally leads them to adopt a literal translation approach that frequently distorts the meanings of these collocations. Al-Hafiz (2004) asserts that even advanced native translators as well as foreign learners of Arabic face difficulties when confronted with Arabic collocations. This being so, the current research aims to examine the difficulties of translating Arabic collocations in the Quran into English, with the intention of providing practical guidance for future Quranic translators.

1.1.7.3 Previous studies on the translation of Quranic collocations

There have been relatively few studies investigating collocations in the Quran. In their article 'Quranic Collocations: A Problem in Translation' (2014), Kholood Al-Sofi et al discuss the main problems encountered by translators when rendering culturally specific collocations in the Quran from Arabic into English, and suggest solutions to overcome these issues. They

select two translations of the Quran by Al-Hilali and Khan (1996) and Abdel-Haleem (2005) and compare these authors' translations of a selection of collocations to determine which version is the most acceptable and informative. In one example, Al-Sofi voices strong criticism of Abdel-Haleem (2005, 6, 127) for rendering the Quranic collocation '*dar as-salām'* (10:25) as (literally) 'home of peace', thus failing to capture its figurative imagery and idiomatic meaning. In this case, the literal translation causes ambiguity precisely because the concept conveyed by the Arabic collocation is itself ambiguous. Al-Sofi states that some Quranic collocations are culturally specific and translators need to provide more explanation when rendering these collocations into English. For example, he criticises Al-Hilali and Khan (1996, 2, 198) for using cultural borrowing when translating '*mashʿar-il-ḥarām*' (2:198) without clarifying the meaning of the collocation.

Although Al-Sofi et al. (2014) provide a number of interesting examples relating to the problems of translating culturally specific collocations, there are limitations to their study as these authors have analysed the translations of Quranic collocations according to their own knowledge and have not supported their argument sufficiently with references from exegetical sources. In addition, the solutions they suggest are neither sufficient nor sufficiently clear. They mention, for example, that when there is lack of equivalence, translators need to add more information explaining their translation; however, they have not indicated how this should be done. It would have been more useful if the authors had drawn on translation theories and techniques, such as the exegetical translation method proposed by Dickins et al. (2002) or Newmark's semantic and communicative translation theory (1988). Both Newmark and Dickins offer translators useful guidance on how to clarify and explain the implicit meaning of culturally specific collocations, and provide strategies that help the translator reduce the loss of the source text's original meaning and provide an approximate meaning in the target language. Al-Sofi and his co-authors could have suggested techniques such as footnotes, explanatory notes, paraphrasing, and other tactics as a solution to the problems they identify in the work of the authors selected for their study. The only practical advice they offer to the translators is that they should avoid the literal translation of culturally specific collocations and, when using a cultural-borrowing technique, follow this with an explanation. In relation to the latter solution, however, it appears that they have not fully examined the translation of Al-Hilali and Khan (1974: 1996, 42) regarding the collocation'*mashʿar-il-ḥarām*' (2:198): in this example, the translators have used a borrowing strategy in their translation but have also added a footnote explaining its cultural meaning:

‘Muzdalifah a well-known place near Makkah, where pilgrims have to stop and stay for the whole night of the 10th of *Dhul-Hijjah*, or a great part of it.’ Al-Sofi and his co-authors should have reviewed the original copy of the English translation of the Quran by Al-Hilali and Khan, which includes their footnotes.

In an article entitled ‘Issues in Translating Collocations of the Holy Quran’ (2014), Hilal Alshaje’a discusses the major problems encountered by translators when attempting to successfully render collocations in the Quran into English. Alshaje’a looks at three translations of the Quran – by Pickhall (1930: 1983), Ali (1934: 2007) and Arberry (1988) – and compares their respective translations of a selection of collocations (five collocations of the verb + noun type) to see which version most closely resembles the original Quranic text. As part of the analysis, he consulted Quranic exegetical texts by Ibn Kathir (2009), Al-Firuzabadi (2013) and Al-Mahalli and A-Suyuti (2007), in addition to some commonly used dictionaries, to aid his exploration of the difficulties involved in translating the meanings contained in the collocations. In one of Alshaje’a’s examples, the meaning of the collocation ‘*khawalnāhu niʿmatan*’, according to Ibn Kathir (2009, 105), Al-Firuzabadi (2013, 536), and Al-Mahalli and Al-Suyuti (2007, 542), is ‘granting man a favour’. He notes that the translators make use of different verbs and nouns in rendering this collocation into acceptable English, and argues that Pickthall and Arberry show inconsistency in their translation. The former uses the verb ‘grant’ with the noun ‘boon’ while the latter collocates the verb ‘confer’ with the noun ‘blessing’. However, according to Lea (2002, 296) and Ghazala (2007, 170), in English usage, the verb ‘grant’ does not collocate with the noun ‘boon’, and the noun ‘blessing’ can only be collocated with the verb ‘bestow’. Consequently, Alshaje’a argues that Pickthall and Arberry translate the collocation inappropriately, while Ali renders the collocation appropriately, using the verb ‘bestow’ with the noun ‘favour’.

In general, however, Alshaje’a’s article displays a number of shortcomings, probably due to the fact that he did not consult linguistic experts and lexicographers in both Arabic and English to check the meanings of the collocations he discusses. For example, the verb ‘grant’ can collocate with the noun ‘boon’ – although this may be archaic English, it is perfectly acceptable and is still used in legal terminology – while the noun ‘blessing’ can also be collocated with the verb ‘confer’. Therefore, it appears that Pickthall and Arberry do in fact translate the collocation suitably. In addition, Alshaje’a does not propose any solutions to the translation problems he exposes or consider the wider implications of translating Quranic collocations. He concludes that the three translators faced difficulties in rendering the

collocations into appropriate English due to a lack of awareness of their implied meanings, but the only suggestion he makes is that translators need to be more attentive if the target reader is to achieve a better understanding of the sacred text,.

Another article, 'Problems in Translating Collocations in Religious Texts from Arabic into English' by Dweik and Mariam (2011), analyses in detail the results of an empirical study designed to investigate the problems of translating semantic and lexical contextualised collocations in three religious texts: namely, the Quran, the Hadiths and the Bible. The authors selected thirty-five Masters students majoring in translation at three different Jordanian universities, based in Jordan, Yarmouk and Petra, to take part in their study. The students were asked to translate forty-five short contextual sentences that appear in these religious texts, fifteen for each text. Those from the Hadiths were selected from two books: *An-Nawawis: Forty Ḥadīths: An Anthology of the Sayings of the Prophet* (1990) by Badawi and *The Blessing of Islam* (1997) by Alkhuli. The set tests were checked for validity and reliability by a panel composed of three academic specialists. Dweik and Mariam then analysed the problems the students encountered when attempting to translate semantic collocations, observing that most of the errors were due to the students' failure to recognise unusual combinations of words that carry certain semantic messages in those instances where collocations possess a connotative metaphorical sense. They give the following example: most of the students translated the collocation '*ishtaʿalā ar-raʾsu shayban*'(19:4) using an inappropriate lexical item for the verb '*ishtaʿalā*', rendering it in English as 'glistens', 'shines' or 'glows' (2011, 26). All of these verbs belong to one semantic field, conveying a sense of brightness, but none are applicable here as they fail to express the meaning of the verb as it appears in this verse. The metaphor used here indicates that someone's formerly black hair has turned totally grey, completely losing its colour, comparing this to the process by which fire consumes everything around it until there is nothing left. Dweik and Mariam conclude that the level of the performance in general was very low as the translation students were unfamiliar with certain collocations in the source language as well as in the target language. Most collocational patterns in the Quran and the Bible are considered unusual. The students, therefore, committed errors because they did not possess any expertise in translating the sort of allusive collocations that are frequently found in religious texts into everyday language. Another reason for their unsatisfactory results was the lack of dictionaries – whether monolingual or bilingual – dealing with collocations in general and in religious texts in particular. However, Dweik's and Mariam's paper does not engage with translation theories

and methods, or with some of the techniques that could help translators to overcome the specific problems raised by collocations in religious texts. Furthermore, the validity and reliability of their tests need to be verified, as the examples the authors chose for the students to translate were highly unusual.

All of the above-mentioned studies display shortcomings, which the research in this thesis strives to avoid by enlisting the help of translation theory. In addition, it addresses the subject of translation techniques, such as the use of paraphrasing, footnotes, cultural borrowing, shifts, descriptive equivalents, explanatory notes and additional information, and their application to the translation of Quranic collocations. In this respect, this study fills a significant gap and should benefit future translators by helping them improve their methods of translation and by offering some useful methods and techniques as a guide to developing more suitable approaches. It exemplifies the advantages and disadvantages of different ways of translating Quranic collocations by analysing a selected sample of translations, and presents some exegetical works that could help translators recognise the ambiguous and pragmatic meanings embedded in the sacred text, particularly those expressed in its collocations. As such, this study should make a valuable contribution to existing studies of English translations of the Quran.

1.1.8 Structure of the thesis

Following this introductory chapter, Chapter Two presents the theoretical framework of the thesis, and introduces the definition and aim of translation theory. This is followed by a review of translation theory as it existed before the twentieth century and of the subsequent development of modern translation theory. The latter is divided into a number of subjects, including the different views concerning literal translation, Skopos theory, and Nida's theory of formal and dynamic equivalence, followed by a brief survey of the critiques of Nida's model. The chapter then examines Newmark's (1988) semantic and communication translation theory, the exegetic translation method proposed by Dickins et al. (2002), and the problem of meaning and equivalence. Finally, it addresses the danger of so-called 'translation loss' and the strategies that can be used to avoid this pitfall.

Chapter Three looks at the background of the Quranic text, concentrating on its place within Islam as divine revelation, while also addressing the characteristics of the Arabic language as it is used in the Quran, with the focus on the text's inimitability. It sheds light on

some of the significant features of the text, including the style and structure of its language. The chapter then revisits some of the debates among Islamic scholars over the text's translation, and further discusses the difficulties translators encounter when attempting to render the Quran fully comprehensible in another language, especially linguistic problems (lexical, syntactic and semantic), including the issues raised by its cultural specificity and its use of metonymy, metaphors and collocations. This is followed by a consideration of the way translators' (implicit or explicit) ideology can affect their work, and a discussion of the role that *tafsīr* or interpretation plays in translating the Quran. The chapter concludes by analysing the different approaches to Quranic translation.

The fourth chapter begins by describing the concept of collocations as a linguistic phenomenon and elucidates their meanings and restrictions, as well giving instances of collocational clashes. It examines the debates among theorists over Arabic collocations, with some arguing that their meaning is determined by semantic relations and others contending that it is determined by grammatical structures. The chapter then reviews the general linguistic theory of English collocations, and the varied scholarly responses to Firth's theory of meaning (1957). It also focuses on typologies of collocations in both Arabic and English, and provides a comparison of Arabic and English collocations, followed by a categorisation of collocations in the Quran, with particular reference to culturally specific collocations.

The fifth chapter opens with a short history of English translations of the Quran, divided into two parts, the first of which discusses English translations by non-Muslims and the second, English translations by Muslims. It introduces the biographies of the Quranic translators whose works have been selected for the comparative study – Pickthall, Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan. The next section focuses on critical assessments of their translations of the Quran by a number of translation theorists and scholars who discuss and critique these authors' methods and approach.

Chapter Six introduces problematic issues in the translation of Quranic collocations followed by the comparative semantic analysis of the three English translations selected for the study, using a sample of twenty culturally specific collocations found in the Quran. The analysis focuses on the strategies and procedures employed by these translators, with the aim of exploring the difficulties that arise when using a literal translation method to render culturally specific collocations in the Quran into English. The chapter shows that the free

translation method, which focuses on content rather than form, is a more suitable approach when attempting to transfer the implicit meanings of collocations.

The final chapter, Chapter Seven, presents a critical analysis of the findings of the comparative study. It answers the research questions outlined above and proposes some methods and strategies that could be used to solve the issues that arise when translating the collocations found in the Quran. Finally, it describes the contribution of this research to the field of Quranic translation, while acknowledging the limitations of the study, and offers some recommendations for further research.

Chapter Two

Translation Theory

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a critical overview of some key translation theories in order to establish the basis of the theoretical framework for the current study, starting with a consideration of what is meant by the concept of translation theory and then turning to a discussion of the usefulness of translation theory when attempting to solve the problems encountered when rendering text from the source language into the target language. It examines some key classical and modern approaches to translation theory, analysing the debates that arose over issues relating to literal and free translation methods prior to the twentieth century, before shifting the focus onto modern translation theories, including the Skopos theory proposed by Katharina Weiss and Hans Vermeer (2000). It also reviews equivalence theories, typologies and related issues, together with Newmark's (1988) semantic and communicative translation theory, the exegetic translation method suggested by Dickins et al. (2002), and the subject of translation loss. The chapter concludes by considering how the translation strategies proposed by various scholars can be used with a free translation method to help provide solutions to the problems encountered in translation and reduce the loss of meaning that can occur during the translation process.

2.2 What is translation theory?

According to Williams (2013), different scholars understand the concept of translation theory in different ways. Chesterman (2007), for example, defines translation theory as 'a view of translation or some part or aspect of it which helps us to understand it better', while Pochhacker (2004) observes that the various theories tend to propose similar ideas. For Newmark (1996), translation theory is the body of knowledge that we currently possess about the process of translating and consists of identifying and defining a translation problem, addressing all those factors that need to be considered in the attempt to solve it. He states that it is necessary to identify all the possible translation procedures before recommending the most suitable of these, together with an appropriate translation, concluding that translation theory serves no purpose if it does not emerge from the struggle to solve actual problems that arise in the practice of translation.

In his analysis of translation theories, Anthony Pym (2014) maintains that a theory describes the situation where the reproduction and choice process occurs, commenting that translators are in effect constantly theorising as they work: when they recognise a translation problem, they compare the different potential solutions and then choose the most appropriate one. Transforming this process of ad-hoc theorising into an established theory involves developing and defining the terminology for the different aspects of translation, and devising appropriate methods that can be applied during the process. In this sense, theories help translators to think about relevant questions and may sometimes suggest possible answers. Pym, therefore, believes that translation theory and practice are complementary.

Baker (2011), meanwhile, emphasises the importance of providing systematic training for those wishing to enter the translation field: she argues that formal academic training should include a strong theoretical component because this encourages students to reflect on what they do, how they do it and why they do it, from a variety of perspectives. Furthermore, it allows them to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of different versions of their work. Baker strongly criticises professional translators who believe that translation is an art that simply requires practice and general knowledge, in contrast to Pym (2014), who argues that there is no empirical evidence for this criticism, since all translators theorise. Pym asserts that untrained translators with less knowledge of complex theories may in fact work more productively and at a faster rate than those who are acquainted with translation theories.

To summarise, theories are sometimes necessary for academic work, but this does not mean that translation theories can teach translators how to translate; however, theories can help them formulate alternative translations and decide which of these represents the best solution.

2.3 The aim of translation theory

Williams (2013, 20) identifies six possible aims of translation theory as presented and summarised by different translation theorists. The first goal, introduced by Chesterman (2000a, 48), is ‘to describe what translators do, what strategies they use, and what roles they play, under given linguistic and socio-cultural conditions’. The second is to explain the causes, processes, and/or effects of translation, providing ‘principles of explanation for a class of phenomena’ (Neubert, 2000, 25). Thirdly, translation theory should be predictive, extrapolating how translators are likely to act or what translations may look like under certain

conditions (Holmes, 1988). The fourth purpose of translation theory is to offer translators solutions, or as Lefevere (1978) puts it, 'the goal of the discipline is to produce a comprehensive theory which can be used as a guideline for the production of translations'. Williams (2013, 20) refers to Venuti (2004) who also highlights this relationship between theory and practice, defining translation theory as 'the formulation of concepts designed to illuminate and improve the practice of translation'. Williams states that its fifth purpose is to serve as a model for research in translation studies. Tymoczko (2007), for example, calls on those working within this discipline to 'define methodologies appropriate to its own subject matter that will nonetheless retain the basic characteristics of research, namely measurement, verifiability and replicability'. The final aim is to create criteria that can be used to evaluate translation: in his overview of Chinese translation theories, Xinzhang (2002) argues that these criteria 'lie at the very heart of translation theory'. Newmark further elaborates on the usefulness of translation theories:

> Translation theories attempt to give some insight into the relation between thought, meaning and language; the universal, cultural and individual aspects of language behaviour; the understanding of cultures; the interpretation of texts that may be clarified and even supplemented by way of translation. (Newmark 1988, 19)

Therefore, put simply, translation theories provide a rationale for translators and may help them to choose the most suitable method to render a text successfully into another language.

2.4 Translation theories before the twentieth century

Munday (2012) examines the pre-twentieth century translation methods and debates about the relative merits of word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation that dominated much of translation theory during what Newmark (1988, 4) calls the 'pre-linguistics period' of translation. Western translation theory seemed locked in what Steiner (1998, 319) labels a sterile debate concerning three models: namely, literalism, paraphrase and free imitation. According to Munday (2012), the distinction between word-for-word (literal) and sense-for-sense (free) translation goes back as far as Cicero (106-43 BCE) and St. Jerome (347-420 CE), both of whom disapproved of literal translation. When the latter was strongly criticised for his translation of a letter to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, he defended himself by stating that word-for-word translation produces an inappropriate message while a sense-for-sense approach allows the content of the original text to be conveyed. Munday also emphasises that

theologian and religious reformer Martin Luther (1530: 1963), scholar and translator Étienne Dolet (1540: 1997) and poet and playwright John Dryden (1631-1700) all followed St. Jerome in rejecting a word-for-word translation strategy on the grounds that it would be unable to convey the same meaning as the source text and would sometimes be incomprehensible. Instead, all three advocated the use of sense-for-sense (free) translation as they believed it can convey the deep meaning of the source language and carry the message in an informative way to the readership, while literal translation can obscure the meaning of the original text because it adheres to its forms and structures and fails to pay attention to its meaning, which is often reliant on context. In the case of poetic or religious texts in particular, Dolet (1540: 1997) argued that it is better for translators to use the free translation method to clarify any ambiguous components in the text because literal translation, in some situations, will not convey its meaning. Literal translation should be used only when needed: for example, when translating the meaning of each word that does not bear a separate deeper or implicit meaning.

In relation to this, Menacere (2009, cited in Sumaya Najjar, 2012, 25-26) provides an interesting example from the Bible (one that is also used in the Lord's Prayer): 'Give us this day our daily bread.' He questions how the word 'bread' could be translated into the languages of Amazonian tribes who may never have seen this foodstuff. In such cases, literal translation will not succeed in conveying the meaning of the word; instead, a free translation method should be used, with an explanation of the term provided in a footnote, a paraphrase or with the use of another technique that can help convey the message by transferring the cultural aspects of the source language into the target language.

In her discussion of the pre-twentieth century debate over literal vs. free translation theories, Bassnett (2014) notes that in *The Art of Poetry*, the classical Roman author Horace (65-8 BCE) cautioned against imitating the source model, arguing that anyone who uses word-for-word translation is a slavish translator; instead, he recommended using and adding new words. Both he and Cicero asserted that the art of the translator is to interpret the source text by adopting sense-for-sense translation and avoiding word-for-word translation. Bassnett also describes how the work of the first-century Roman rhetorician Quintilian was popular in the medieval educational system. He extolled the benefits of using a two-stage paraphrasing technique when translating as he believed that this could help students to analyse the structure of a text and understand its meaning, as well as developing their imaginative powers. This technique involved the translator in undertaking an initial paraphrasing, followed by the

addition of further information, using their own style. Bassnett (2014), however, also refers to the playwright George Chapman (1559-1634), who, in his *Epistle to the Reader*, remarked on his own translation of *The Iliad*, expressing the opinion that translators must avoid both word-for-word translation and overly loose translations; rather, they should aspire to convey the spirit of the original text. Chapman's theory is useful: overly loose or unduly free translation techniques need to be avoided as redundancy in the text may confuse intended readers, rendering the message inaccurate due to an excess of information. Translators should add information only when needed; if necessary, they can provide more detail in a footnote.

Mona Baker and Sameh Hanna (2009) shed light on the use of literal and free translation in the ninth and tenth centuries in the Middle East during the Abbasid period, known as the 'Golden Age' of translation in the Arab world. Ibn Ishaq (809-73 CE) – known as Joannitius in the Western tradition – is the most famous translator of this period due to his translations of classical Greek philosophical, scientific and medical material into Arabic: he translated over a hundred manuscripts into Syriac and thirty-nine into Arabic, including the works of Aristotle, Plato and Ptolemy. Baker and Hanna (2009, 333) highlight two of the translation approaches adopted at the time. The first relates to two Syrian scholars who pioneered the translation of ancient Greek works into Arabic: Ibn al-Bitriq (730-815 CE) and Ibn al-Himsi (d. 800 CE). Baker and Hanna argue that both scholars used an inappropriate literal translation method in their work, substituting every Greek word with an equivalent Arabic one. Moreover, if a word did not exist in Arabic, they simply transliterated the Greek word. Many of their translations were subsequently revised by al-Ma'mun (813-833 CE). The second method relates to the work of Ibn Ishaq (809-73 CE) and Al-Jawhari (803-97), which included the use of sense-for-sense translation in order to produce fluent texts that transferred the meaning of the original without deforming the receptor language. As Ibn Ishaq and Al-Jawari focused mainly on the requirements of the TL and its potential readers, their work was more informative and accessible. For this reason, Ibn Ishāq's translations of the ancient works of medical science can still be understood by the modern-day non-expert.

The focus in the following section shifts to consider translation theories during the twentieth century.

2.5 Translation theories in the twentieth century

2.5.1 Different views on literal translation

Translation theorists have discussed the literal translation method from various perspectives, although most have reached broadly similar general conclusions. Some see literal translation as an accurate method of rendering the source text, which can be supplemented with footnotes or paraphrasing for clarification, while others believe that this technique should be used sparingly, and only when needed, and yet others reject the literal translation method altogether because it fails to reduce translation loss.

Nida (2003) asserts that formal equivalence concentrates on the form and content of the message itself, believing that translators should be concerned with correspondence in terms of sentence-to-sentence, concept-to-concept or poem-to-poem translation, adding that the target-language message should approximate as far as possible the different elements of the source language. He also notes that: 'the type of translation which most completely typifies this structural equivalence might be called a "gloss translation" in which the translator attempts to reproduce as literally and meaningfully as possible the form and the content of the original' (2003, 159). He illustrates this with the example of the biblical phrase 'holy kiss' (Romans 16: 16). In a gloss translation this would be translated literally, followed by a footnote explaining that this phrase referred to the traditional method of greeting in New Testament times. Thus, for Nida, literal translation means reproducing a number of elements of the source language, including grammatical correspondence, word equivalence and contextual meaning.

Newmark (1991, 124) claims that '[i]f the genius or the particular of the foreign language is to be preserved, cleanly and straight, only two procedures can preserve it – transference and literal translation'. He further elaborates that '[l]iteral translation can show up the depth of one nation's culture by converting it into words' (1991, 44). However, Newmark (1995) also asserts that, for the most part, literal translation can only function appropriately at word level, although it can sometimes do so above word level if the source-language and target-language meanings correspond closely – in other words, if the referent and its pragmatic effects are equivalent. He concludes that the less words are context-bound (as in, for example, lists, technical terms, original metaphors, unacceptable collocations), the more likely it is that literal translation can be used, whereas the more standard the nature of

the collocations, colloquialisms, idioms and stock metaphors employed, the less likely it is that literal translation will be possible.

According to Chesterman (2017), some theorists believe that literal translation method is ungrammatical, although others disagree. He notes that Vinay and Darbelnet (1958), for example, argue that literal translation can be used as needed in a text. For Chesterman (2017), even though a literal translation stays close to the language of the original text, it can still be considered grammatically correct. A literal translation can exhibit the maximum of formal correspondence within the limitations of the target language's grammar, and there will be one literal translation in a given target language for any given source text. Chesterman also refers to Dimitrova (2005, 51-52), who states that a text may be translated freely but still contain some elements that are rendered literally, while another may in general be literally translated but also contain elements that are not. Chesterman concludes that literal translation is essential to a translation process that includes effective theoretical implications about the cognitive relation between meaning and form.

Dickins et al. (2002), on the other hand, do not favour literal translation, asserting that it always leads to translation loss due to the lack of synonymous words between the source and target languages; for this reason, free translation is preferable. These authors explain that in this form of translation there is a global correspondence between the textual units of the source text and those of the target text, illustrating the technique that can be used in free translation by providing possible English equivalents for a number of colloquial Arabic proverbs (2002, 17). For example:

> You win some, you lose some
> *Yawmun laka wa yawmunʿalīk* (literally, 'One day for you, another day against you')
> Let bygones be bygones
> *Illī fāt māt* (literally, 'what is past has died')

They explain that the grammar and vocabulary of the English text is completely different to the Arabic, and in the second example, the metaphor included in the Arabic source text of '*māt*' (dying) is lost. This can be attributed to the fact that translators need to use the free translation method when faced with figurative language such as metaphors, collocations, and metonymy and polysemous words.

To conclude, as Vinay and Darblent (1958) and Chesterman (2017) state, literal translation can be used where possible, especially as it maintains the text of the source language. However, this approach should not be adopted in all cases because it may sometimes deform the meaning of the original text when the translator is dealing with figurative language. Equally, Nida's approach of formal equivalence with a gloss translation does not work on all occasions; when it comes into rendering sacred texts, a free translation method is more suitable to deal with classical words that have difficult meanings to be understood since this approach being faitful to the original meaning and does not pay attention to the forms of the grammatical constructions, styles, and other norms in the source language. In addition free translation uses different techniques to convey the message informatively to the audience such as footnote, paraphrase, explanatory note, shifting, and descriptive and functional equivalence. If it is the case as Nida suggesting to use a literal translation to preserve the form and structure of the source language and to be followed by a gloss translation (footnotes) for the purpose of explaining the terms and preserve the content, then there will be redundancy in translation process and this may confuse the target readers.Therefore simply copying the structural form of the source language at all times can result in a translation that sounds alien to the intended readers since linguistic systems are different among languages and literal translation can be used when needed while the gloss translation can only be used when there are ambiguous and cultural meanings in the source language that need to be explained in the target language.

2.5.2 Skopos theory

Bassnett (2014) states that the debate between those favouring word-for-word or literal translation and advocates of a sense-for-sense translation that does not follow the original linguistic structures closely remains intense. This debate centres on whether the translator's essential responsibility is to the original author or to their target-language readers, and to what extent they should be free to deviate from the original text. German linguists Weiss and Vermeer (1978) developed this distinction between the word-for-word and sense-for-sense approaches into what they termed 'Skopos theory' (Bassnett, 2014).Vermeer (2000, 221 cited in Bassnett, 2014, 6) defines the word *'skopos'* as a technical term used to denote the aim and purpose of a translation. His hypothesis is that the aim of the translation justifies the approach employed. Bassnett (2014, 6) gives the example of legal translators who, rather than produce a translation that mirrors the linguistic structures of the original text, produce a target-

language text based on the norms of the textual construction operating in the target language's legal system. Bassnett maintains that Skopos theory is successful because it concentrates on the function of a text in the target-language system, encouraging translators to avoid word-for-word translation when this is not necessary. In other words, as the theory is pragmatic, translators have the freedom to choose their own approach and can make adjustments by adding or deleting information.

According to Prunce (2003, cited in Celia De leon, 2008), Skopos theory has shifted the translation model from its purely linguistic conceptual framework to a functional and socio-cultural one. Sunwoo (2007, cited in Ika Kana Trinsnawati, 2014) maintains that this approach tends to focus on translations whose emphasis lies somewhere between extra-linguistic factors (i.e. the cultural context and the readership) and textual factors (i.e. the purpose of the text). Although this relatively new approach aims to achieve a functional equivalence that is not necessarily similar to the source text, it has been criticised by some translation theorists such as Newmark (1991, cited in Christina Schaffner, 1998, 237), Nord (1991, cited in Benjamin Green, 2012, 111), and Koller (1990, cited in Schäffner, 1998, 237). Newmark (1991) argues that the approach is simplistic and produces an inaccurate message that cannot fully convey any deeper allegorical meaning contained in the source text. Besides which, he maintains that this approach impairs the source language. Christiane Nord (1991) also asserts that Skopos theory cannot be applied to literary texts, including religious texts, because these include highly expressive and stylistic language. In this case, functional equivalence can never be achieved. Meanwhile, Koller (1990) believes that, in spite of the fact that this approach tends to produce equivalent text, it should use the source text rather than the target text as a starting point.

Overall, Skopos theory is a basically functionalist approach that appears to be useful and simple in certain situations. As such, it can at times provide solutions to some of the problems translators face; however, it cannot be applied to all types of text. This theory has been criticized by Newmark (2000: 259-60) and states that '[it] is pretending too much and going too far'. As such, it neither focus and take into account the source text norms, nor the metaphorical meanings of the source language entirely. Jawad Jaber (2006) has also criticized this theory that it allows the end to justify the means in translation as Vermeer (1978) stated, and therefore this theory cannot be applied to translation of literary and religious texts. Translating collocations in Quranic text into English sometimes requires descriptive

equivalent method, and therefore Skopos theory may not serve this purpose. However, this theory may work better when it comes into functional equivalent method.

2.5.3 Nida's formal and dynamic equivalence

Nida's theory of translation, by contrast, developed directly from his own practical work – translating and organising the translation of the Bible. He attempted to bring biblical translation into a more scientific era by incorporating recent work in linguistics. The scientific approach he proposed in *Toward a Science of Translating* (1964) and *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (1969) tackles the problems of meaning, equivalence and translatability, which became a constant theme of the developing field of translation studies during the 1960s. Nida rejects the concepts of word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation, opting instead for the terms 'formal' and 'dynamic equivalence'. Examining the differences between these two types of equivalence, Munday (2012) notes that, according to Nida, the former focuses attention on the message itself in both form and content while the latter is based on the principle of equivalent effect, in which the message and content is the same in both languages, aiming at complete naturalness of expression. For Nida, the success of a translation can be judged on the extent to which it achieves an equivalent effect or response. To this end, there are four basic requirements for a translation: (1) it should make sense; (2) it should convey the spirit and manner of the original; (3) it should have a natural and easy form; and (4) it should produce a similar response. Nida observes that the conflict between content and form cannot always be easily resolved. Correspondence in meaning, therefore, must take priority over correspondence in style if equivalent effect is to be achieved.

Nida's more systematic approach towards translating religious texts borrows theoretical concepts and terminology both from semantics and pragmatics and from Chomsky's work (1957, 1965) on syntactic structure. Chomsky's generative transformational model analyses sentences, organising them into rule-based, sequence-related levels. These produce a deep structure, formed by transformational rules relating one deep structure to another – for example, relating active to passive – in a way that creates a final surface structure that is subject to phonological and morphological rules. Nida integrates the main features of Chomsky's model into his own science of translation: a three-stage system consisting of analysis, transfer and restructuring. Munday (2012) relates Nida's work to Taber's (1969, 39), which emphasises that 'kernel' sentences form the most basic structures of Chomsky's model. These can be acquired from the source text's surface structure by a

reductive process of back information, which includes the application of the four types of functional classes in generative-transformational grammar: (1) events that are often achieved by verbs such as ‘fall’, ‘run’, ‘grow’; (2) objects that are often performed by nouns such as ‘horse’, ‘mountain’, ‘table’; (3) abstracts that denote quantities and qualities, including adjectives and adverbs such as ‘red’, ‘slowly’, ‘length’; and (4) relations that include affixes, prepositions, conjunctions and copulas such as ‘pre’, ‘into’, ‘of’, ‘and’, ‘because’, ‘be’. Nida (2003, 64) illustrates his use of Chomsky’s theory with some examples indicating different structures using the preposition ‘of’:

> Surface structure: ‘will of God’
> Back transformation: B (object, God) performs A (event, wills)
> Surface structure: ‘creation of the world’
> Back transformation: B (object, the world) is performed by A (event, creates)

Nida asserts that this approach provides translators with a technique that can be used for decoding the source text and encoding the target text.

Nida formulated this systematic approach in order to help translators acquire an understanding of the discipline and the tools required to translate the Bible, and thus help resolve the numerous controversies that the translation of the religious text has provoked. Raed Al-jabari (2008, 38) observes, for example, that in the nineteenth century some biblical translators believed that literal translation was the most appropriate method and that all aspects of language, including words, idioms, grammar and style, ought to be rendered literally. These scholars claimed that if translators used other methods, they would be using their own words in place of the original, and therefore the translation would not be faithful to the biblical text. Conversely, others believed that the words must be rendered literally but the translation must also respect and match the target language’s grammar and syntax.

Nevertheless, Munday (2012) observes that Nida’s work was criticised by Van den Broeck (1978, 40), Larose (1989, 78) and Lefevere (1993, 7) on the grounds that the principle of equivalent effect and the concept of equivalence were still overly concerned with the word level. Indeed, equivalence seems impossible: how can a text possibly have the same effect and produce the same response in different cultures and at different historical eras? Munday notes that the heated debates about Nida’s systematic linguistic approach to translation attracted many prominent translation scholars, among them Newmark. According to Abdul-Raof (2001, 17), Newmark argues that some translators of the Bible have adopted a

communicative translation strategy, illustrating this with an example from Nida's well-known translation of the biblical phrase 'Lamb of God' in the Inuit language as 'Seal of God', on the basis that the Inuit are 'not acquainted with lambs' (Nida and Reyburn, 1981, 1).

Newmark (1988, 45) criticises the new translations of the Bible that have become more communicative, with omissions of the original dialect, slang and technical terms, asserting that as a result the meaning of the biblical stories are not fully conveyed. He argues that communicative translation works better in drama than in poetry or serious fiction, and contends that 'Bible translation should be both semantic and communicative'. Newmark (1988) distinguishes between semantic and literal translation, stating that only the former respects the context of the source text, as the translator's loyalty is first and foremost to the author, whereas in literal translation this loyalty is to the norms of the source language.

2.5.4 Semantic and communicative translation theory

The present research adopts Newmark's semantic and communicative translation theory (1988) as the theoretical basis of its comparative analysis. According to Munday (2012), Newmark formulated his theory in response to the critical debates around Nida's approach to translation: Newmark opposes the idea of equivalent effect, arguing that while this may be a desirable outcome, it does not achieve the aims of translation, with the result that the gap between the source language and the target language remains a major problem in translation theory and practice. He advocates instead a new translation method, suggesting that this gap could be narrowed by employing semantic and communicative models of translation. Thus, 'only semantic and communicative translation fulfil the two main aims of translation, which are first, accuracy, and second, economy' (1995, 47). Newmark argues that a semantic translation is more likely to be economical because it is written at the same level as the original text: it concentrates on and explains in detail the author's intentions and the meaning of the text. Communicative translation, by contrast, conveys the information in the source text in a manner that can be easily understood by the target audience. In other words, a semantic translation method places more emphasis on explaining the text by following the thoughts and intentions of the author, transferring its component elements and its exact contextual meaning into the target language, helping readers to understand its connotations. A communicative translation, on the other hand, focuses mainly on the message itself and attempts to convey this as accessibly as possible to its readers.

Newmark (1988, 39) provides the following example to illustrate the difference between communicative and semantic translation: using the former technique, the phrases '*Bissiger Hund'* or *'Chien Mechant'* would be translated as 'Beware of the dog', while in the latter, these phrases would be rendered as 'a dog that bites' or 'a savage dog'. In his opinion, communicative translation is able to emphasise the image rather than the content of the message, while semantic translation is more informative but less effective. Newmark recommends using the semantic translation method for expressive texts that contain cultural and allegorical expressions and the communicative method for informative texts, which focus on knowledge and facts, and vocative texts that use persuasive language to call upon readers to act, feel or think. Newmark (1988, 63) notes: 'I have adapted Nabokov in defining semantic translation as an attempt to render, as closely as the semantic and syntactic structure of the TL [target language] allow, the exact contextual meaning of the original.' He also states that semantic translation is usually both linguistic and encyclopaedic in that it tends to be more explicit and more detailed, aiming to explain the expressive components and illuminate the contextual meaning of the source text. Communicative translation, meanwhile, is functional and tends to be more direct and idiomatic. Although semantic and communicative methods differ in their functions, Newmark (1988, 62) argues that they work together as a functional and applicable model since 'all translation must be in some degree both communicative and semantic, social and individual'.

Arguably, the semantic and communicative translation method can therefore be applied to Quranic translation because, as Newmark (1988, 39) states, 'semantic translation attempts to render – as closely as the semantic and syntactic structures of the second language allow – the exact contextual meaning of the original' while communicative translation attempts to produce on its readers an effect as close as possible to that obtained on the readers of the original. Thus, while a semantic translator focuses on the author whereas a communicative translation tends to concentrate on the reader, Newmark maintains that if the two methods are employed together, they can achieve the aims of translation. However, Reem Al-Salam believes that, on the contrary, although the semantic translation method can be adopted in the translation of the Quran, the use of the communicative model cannot be justified:

> Newmark seems to be quite justified in recommending semantic translation for religious texts. This is truer of the Qur'anic text, in particular, because Muslims believe that the Qur'an is all divine and its language carries layers

> after layers of meaning. Therefore, a translator cannot claim that he can determine the force (or act) in a verse and render it communicatively, ignoring all language that does not serve to express that force. (Reem Al-Salem, 2008, 92)

Nevertheless, I would argue that the use of semantic translation alone, isolated from the communicative model, cannot serve the purpose of translating the sacred text since it means that the target readers will sometimes be unable to fully comprehend the message, whereas if it is used in addition to a communicative translation, the meaning of the text will be more accessible to the non-Arabic reader. In this respect, as Newmark (1988, 39) states, 'communicative translation addresses itself solely to the second reader, who does not anticipate difficulties or obscurities, and would expect a generous transfer of foreign elements into his own culture as well as his language where necessary'.

2.5.5 Exegetic translation method

This study also adopts the exegetic translation method proposed by Dickins et al., who state:

> [This method] mitigates the loss of important source text features by approximating their effects in the target language through means other than those used in the source text. In other words, one type of translation loss is palliated by deliberate introduction of another, considered less unacceptable by the translator. (Dickins et al., 2002, 40-41)

Dickins believes that the exegetic translation method can reduce translation loss with the use of strategies such as footnotes, commentaries and explanatory notes to indicate and elucidate the ambiguous meaning of the source language. According to Manna' Al-Qattan (1990), a number of Muslim scholars agree that translators of the Quran should turn to an exegetical method of translation, based on the commentary on and explication of the Quranic text. In fact, there is a growing consensus among Muslim scholars that the meaning of the Quran can be rendered into the target language more faithfully by using exegetic translation. The method can function as a compensation tool, helping reduce the loss of meaning in the translation of the source text into the target language by explaining and clarifying the text. Thameen Ushama (1995, 113-114) comments that exegetic translation (*al-tarjamah tafsiriyyah*) is explanatory and illustrative: 'It further refers to an explanation of the meaning of the word in other languages without confining [itself] to [the] arrangement of the original words or consideration of its organization.' Exegetic translation, therefore, elucidates the

meaning of the words and phrases in the original text rather than mirroring its structures and word order.

According to Abdul-Raof (2001), the Quran includes historical and geographical facts as well as stories, cultural expressions, evocative names and legal science. Thus, a Quranic translation that does not include footnotes can sometimes lead to misunderstandings and misconceptions. The translator needs to be aware of the exegetic textual materials present in the Quran and have sufficient knowledge to be able to offer information explicating these materials and to employ the exegetic translation method to transfer the meaning of the Arabic Quran successfully to a non-Arabic-speaking readership. If deployed properly, the exegetic translation method can eliminate potential misunderstandings among target-language readers by using marginal notes and commentaries to illuminate the contextual meanings of the verses and thus make the text accessible and intelligible to its readers.

Ushama (1995), meanwhile, asserts that it is neither possible nor permissible to translate the Quran word for word, since it sometimes uses words in their metaphorical sense and the translator may be tempted to use a synonym in the target language, unaware of the fact that the original text holds a secondary meaning. As a result, errors may occur in the attempt to render the meaning of the Quran intelligible in the target language. Ushama, therefore, supports the view that the exegetic translation method is the most appropriate for accurately conveying the meaning of the Quranic text in another language. As Abdul-Raof (2001, 140) puts it poetically, ‘a footnote or even an extended commentary can function as a torch that can penetrate the fog of both language and culture-specific religious words and concepts’.

Both Newmark’s semantic and communicative translation methods (used together) and the exegetical translation method respect the context of the Quran by clarifying and explicating the implicit meanings of the text’s collocations and phrases. Both methods sometimes have to interpret and explain ambigious and allegorical meanings; however, it appears that the exegetical translation method can explicate more broadly than the semantic and communicative method by using such techniques as explanatory and marginal footnotes to elucidate the unique linguistic, rhetorical and socio-cultural background of Quranic discourse for the target audience, making the translation more accessible and informative.

2.6 The problem of meaning and equivalence

Munday (2012:59) explores equivalence and equivalent effect, observing that Jakobson (1959: 2004, 139) clarifies the problem of producing equivalence in meaning between words in different languages by arguing that there is ordinarily no full equivalence between so-called 'code-units'. He illustrates his point with an interesting example, noting that what is understood by 'cheese' in English is not identical to the Russian '*syr*', Spanish '*queso'* or German '*Käse*' since the Russian code-unit does not include the concept of cottage cheese. In Russian, this type of cheese would be '*tvarog*' and not '*syr*' (1959: 2004). He asserts, therefore, that these code-units are dissimilar because they belong to two different sign systems (languages) and the concept of 'cottage cheese' should be rendered as a whole and not as one single code-unit that can be substituted by another. Thus, Russian as a language is still able to express the full semantic meaning of 'cheese' as long as it is broken down into two separate concepts.

According to Munday (2012), Jakobson (1959: 2004) further argues that languages are dissimilar in what they are obliged to convey but similar in what they may convey. The following examples illustrate the levels of difference in gender among languages (Munday, 2012, 60): 'house' is feminine in Romance languages but neuter in English and German; 'honey' is masculine in French, German and Italian, feminine in Spanish and neuter in English. Differences also exist at the level of semantic fields, such as kinship terms. Thus, the German noun '*Geschwister'* is usually rendered in English as 'brothers and sisters' since the term 'siblings' is rather formal. Jakobson concludes that the problem of meaning and equivalence is due to dissimilarities in the construction and terminology of languages rather than the inability of one particular language to fully convey a message that has been written or spoken in another. Munday (2012) refers to Pinker (1994, 57-65; 2007, 124-51) who believes that the vocabulary in a language simply reflects what its speakers need for everyday life. The absence of a word in a language does not mean that a concept cannot be grasped: someone from a hot climate, for example, can be shown slush and snow and understand the difference between them. According to Abdul-Raof (2001, 9), 'at the heart of translation lies the problem of meaning. Every human language has ad hoc linguistic mechanisms to express meaning and change of meaning not only through change of words but also through change of word order'. This idea is supported by Nida (1994), who claims that the semantic association between words in different languages does not include one-to-one sets of words with close similarity or one-to-many sets.

The problem of the transfer of meaning between languages and of equivalence increases when it comes to translating the language of the Quran into another language. For example, words such as '*naẓar*' and '*baṣar*' in the past form literally mean to look or to see, but each has different connotative meanings according to the Quranic context. '*Naẓar*' can mean 'to observe', 'to look' and 'to consider', depending on its context, while '*baṣar*' encompasses the meanings 'to lower ones' gaze', 'a deep understanding' and 'to see'. The translator should, therefore, understand the implicit meanings and seek an approximation when translating such terms as there are no complete equivalences between languages, and he or she will have to make adjustments and changes in the process of translation by using a paraphrase or a footnote when necessary, as well other procedures.

2.7 Translation loss

The concept of 'translation loss' is defined by Dickins et al. (2002, 21) as 'an incomplete replication of the ST [source text] in the TT [target text]', confirming that this loss is not a loss of translation but a loss in the translation process. Dickins' practical recommendation is that the translator should concentrate on limiting translation loss rather than seeking to produce the perfect version of the target text, and he illustrates his point with a series of examples. The Arabic '*baqarah*' and the English word 'cow' are synonyms and there is no loss in denotative meaning in translating one with the other; however, '*baqarah*' and 'cow' clearly sound different, so there is significant loss on the phonic and prosodic levels. If, as Dickins claims, translation loss is inevitable when translating single words, it will of course become ever greater as the structural complexity of the language increases.

Newmark (1988, 7) elaborates further on the reasons for translation loss. Firstly, the loss of meaning may be inevitable due to transferring the elements of the source language into the target language, resulting in more information being added in the target language or less information being transferred from the source language. The second inevitable source of loss is the fact that languages have different lexical, grammatical and sound systems; the closer the languages and cultures involved, the closer the translation will be to the original text. However, Newmark (1988, 8) stresses that few words, phrases or sentences can correspond exactly on what he describes as the four components of the 'lexical range'. The first component is formality (ranging from frozen to uninhibited); the second is feeling or affectivity (ranging from overheated to deadpan); the third is generality or abstraction (ranging from popular to opaquely technical); and the last is evaluation, which can itself be

divided into four subscales: morality (e.g. from good to bad), pleasure (e.g. from nice to nasty), intensity (e.g. from strong to weak) and dimension (e.g. from wide to narrow). Given the differences between languages, the four lexical scales sometimes correspond closely in both languages; sometimes, however, they operate very differently. Baker (2011, 17) gives an illustration of this from the semantic field of temperature, which in English differs somewhat from Arabic. The lexical set in English is 'cold', 'cool', 'hot' and 'warm', while in Arabic there is '*bārid*' (cold/cool), '*dāfī*' (warm) and '*ḥār*' (hot, in terms of the weather) and '*sākhin*' (hot, in terms of objects). Baker notes that, linguistically, Arabic does not distinguish between cold and cool but does differentiate between the temperature of the weather and that of objects.

Bassnett (2014, 39-40) also concludes that linguistic differences mean that translation loss is inevitable, but she believes that what may be lost from the source language context can be replaced in the target language. She refers to Nida's discussions of translation loss whereby source language terms that are not found in the target language have posed problems for translators. When translating from English into the Guaica language of southern Venezuela, Nida experienced difficulties in obtaining equivalents for terms such as 'murder', 'stealing' and 'lying'. Besides which, he found that certain English adjectives, such as 'good', 'bad', 'ugly' and 'beautiful', cover a very dissimilar area of meaning in Guaica, which does not follow a dichotomous typology of 'good' and 'bad' but is more complex: the word 'good' can be applied to delicious food, killing enemies, stealing from anyone not belonging to the same group, and chewing narcotic substances (in moderation), while the word 'bad' refers to spoilt fruit, murdering a person from the same group, stealing from a member of one's extended family, as well as lying to anyone. A third term, 'violating a taboo', is used to refer to a woman who eats tapir meat prior to the birth of her first child or someone who feeds rodents to a child, but it also includes committing incest or a man who is too close to his mother-in-law. These variations in meaning between English and the Guaica language reflect two very different cultures, and translators need to understand these cultural aspects in order to approximate the meaning of words and terms, and reduce the inevitable translation loss. Bassnett (2014) concurs, highlighting the wide range of terms in Finnish that are used to describe different types of snow. The same observation might be made of terminology covering, for example, aspects of camel behaviour in Arabic, or in English for water and light, and types of bread in French. She maintains that all these can pose untranslatable issues for translators.

Although every language has its own linguistic system, translators do not need to imitate the source text completely as such a literal translation might lead to confusion. The translator's job is to decide which relevant features of the source language need to be maintained in the target language in order to convey the message and reduce translation loss. Given that languages differ in terms of their linguistic and cultural systems, translators cannot eliminate translation loss entirely and they may find it particularly challenging in the case of, say, English and Guaica, as noted above. However, they can minimise translation loss by a thorough understanding of both languages and cultures, and by adopting the appropriate translation strategies discussed in the next section.

2.8 Translation strategies

Different types of translation techniques and strategies aimed at overcoming common translation problems have been suggested by Newmark (1995), Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 1958) and Dickins et al. (2002). Newmark (1995) observes that translation strategies can be applied at the level of the text while translation techniques can be applied to sentences and smaller units of language. Newmark, together with Vinay and Darbelnet, examine techniques such as modulation, transposition and equivalence, while Dickins notes that compensation techniques are beneficial particularly when translating culturally specific words in religious texts since an exegetical sentence can be added to transfer the meaning of the source language and so reduce the loss of meaning.

Newmark (1995) states that functional equivalence and descriptive equivalence are useful techniques to employ when translating a text. Functional equivalence reflects a tendency to undertranslate and can be applied to culturally specific words that require the use of a culturally neutral term. Descriptive equivalence, on the other hand, refers to a tendency to overtranslate and is used to explain the meaning of cultural items more generally. Newmark provides the following illustration: if functional equivalence is applied to the Spanish word '*machete',* this might convey the sense of 'cutting or aggression', while in the case of descriptive equivalence, it might be described as 'a Latin American broad, heavy instrument'. However, in this example, descriptive and functional equivalence could be combined in the use of the English term 'knife' (1995, 83). Newmark also refers to procedures that he labels 'shifts' and 'transpositions'. He subdivides these into the obligatory and the optional. The first of these entails changing the grammar of the source language so that it works in the target language; a second type of shift is required when a grammatical

structure in the source language does not exist in the target language. Newmark also differentiates between the terms ‘modulation’, ‘compensation’ and ‘paraphrase’, noting that the first of these was defined by Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 1958, cited in Newmark, 1995, 88) as ‘variation through a change of viewpoint, of perspective and very often of category of thought’. Newmark states that when literal translation is not possible in the target language, free modulation can be used, and suggests using paraphrasing if the text includes important implications.

Newmark (1995, 92) ends his discussion of translation techniques by referring to the use of ‘notes, additions and glosses’, indicating that additional information can be added when there is a difference between the source- and target-language cultures, or to explain words that are difficult to predict. He states that additional information may take different forms in the text. For example, it may be used:

- as an alternative to a translated word;
- as an adjectival clause;
- as a noun in apposition;
- as a participial group;
- in brackets, mostly for a literal translation of a transferred word;
- in parentheses, the longest form of addition.

Newmark advises the translator to insert the additional information in the text itself, observing that for the most part translators do not pay attention to this strategy. However, he emphasises that this also carries a disadvantage in that the difference between the text and the translator’s contribution may not be noticed, and moreover the translator will be unable to use lengthy additions, although the latter problem can be overcome by placing additional information as footnotes at the bottom of the page. He also recommends using notes at the end of chapter. Lastly, Newmark advises the use of a glossary or explanatory notes at the end of the book.

Jean Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (1995: 1958) identify a number of translation techniques. The first is ‘calque’, whereby one language borrows an expression from another by translating each of its elements literally. To illustrate this strategy, the following translation of the Quran (2: 187) includes a calque translation:

> [A]nd eat and drink until the white thread (light) of dawn appears to you distinct from the black thread (darkness of night), then complete your *Saum* (fast) till the nightfall. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).

The Quranic collocations the 'white thread' and 'black thread' are calque translations that form new lexemes in the target language: 'white thread' means the light of day and 'black thread' implies the darkness of night. As this verse shows, once Muslims see the light of dawn appear on the horizon, it is a signal to start fasting; when they see the darkness of night approaching, it indicates nightfall, when they will be able to break their fast, and eat and drink (Ibn Khathir, 1997, 204-205; Al-Tabari, 1997, 573; Al-Qurtubi, (2006, 139-49). A calque technique is an important strategic resource in translation as it helps to raise awareness among the target readers. However, the translator sometimes needs to refer to the intended meanings by using parentheses or explanatory footnotes, as Al-Hilali and Khan do in the above example. The second technique Vinay and Darbelnet highlight is 'literal or word-for-word translation', which involves the direct transfer of a source text into a grammatically and idiomatically appropriate target text. The authors note that this is most commonly used between languages that belong to the same language family in similar cultures. Equivalence is the third technique Vinay and Darbelnet outline, and refers to the use of completely different stylistic and structural methods to render the same situation intelligible in the target language. They provide an interesting onomatopoeic example: if a French person accidently hits their finger with a hammer, then their cry of pain would be rendered as '*aïe*', whereas in the English account of this incident, the cry would be rendered as 'ouch' (1995: 1958, 38).

Dickins et al. (2002, 24) also provide a typology of translation strategies, including translation by omission, translation by addition, cultural transplantation, cultural borrowing and compensation, illustrating these with numerous examples. The first of these, translation by omission, involves omitting a linguistic element that occurs in the source text. In the case of an Arabic/English translation this may be caused, for example, by the different patterns of cohesion between the two languages. Conversely, translation by addition entails adding information to the target text which is not present in the original. This is shown in the following example taken from a newspaper article concerning the war in Kosovo in 1999, which translates the term '*mundhu al-haymanah al-turkīyah*' as 'ever since the days of Turkish hegemony'. The translation is acceptable since the concept of 'hegemony' in English requires the addition of the phrase 'the days of' or a similar time-related expression (Ives, 1999, 13).

With regard to cultural transplantation, Dickins et al. argue that this technique is often closer to adaptation than translation since the source-language culture, in effect, needs to be transplanted into a target-language cultural setting. Another technique these authors highlight is cultural borrowing, which entails transferring a culturally specific term in the source language into the target language using transliteration, without adaptation or further explanation. Cultural borrowing can be employed to overcome gaps between the vocabulary of the two languages; alternatively, source language terms can be used to introduce the flavour of its culture into the translation. Thus, using this technique, the word '*fūṭah*' (used in Iraq to refer to a sarong-like garment worn by women) could remain as '*fūṭah*' in the English translation rather than being described as a 'wrap' or 'robe' (2002, 32). Cultural borrowings of this kind are often signalled by the use of italics in the target text.

Dickins et al. (2002, 41) also explore the topic of compensation in translation, observing that, in one or another of its many forms, it is absolutely essential to the production of an acceptable translation. The way that exegetic translation reduces the loss of important source-text features by approximating the meaning in the target text is an example of compensation. For example, in a Sufi context, the word '*dhikr*' refers to the repeated chanting of a religious phrase, typically '*Allah*'. However, simply using a cultural borrowing and translating this term as '*dhikr*' would be incomprehensible to anyone except a specialist reader. An exegetic translation can be used to clarify the meaning by adding an explanatory phrase, such as 'a communal invocation of the name of God'. This sort of rendering often serves to define the word being used. Dickins et al. acknowledge that such a translation is less economical and semantically less precise than the term in the source text, but this loss is not as serious as the obscurity of '*dhikr*' for English-speaking readers. As such, the use of compensation means the reduction of an unacceptable loss. I would argue that the exegetic method is particularly useful in translating religious terms in the Quran into another language, as this approach can elucidate ambiguous meanings and approximate concepts in the target language, significantly reducing the loss of meaning. Another example provided by Dickins and his co-authors (2002, 39) comes from the short story, *Mishwār Drīs*. In this, the phrase '*Zubidah zaghradat waḥyna*' means, literally, 'Zubidah [a woman's name] let out an ululation'. A possible way of translating '*zaghradat*' in this extract would be to leave it as a literal translation, 'let out an ululation', as this is a culturally specific vocal sound, but the danger is that this could sound facetious or comic. The loss could be reduced by adding an exegetic phrase such as 'let out an ululation as women do at times of great joy'.

Nida (2003) expands on the above technique, maintaining that such adjustments are necessary since a literal translation will sometimes lead to meaningless expressions, and the required alterations must be explained in marginal footnotes. According to Nida (2003, 238-39), footnotes have two principle functions:

1. to correct linguistic and cultural discrepancies by:
   a) explaining contradictory customs;
   b) identifying unknown geographical or physical objects;
   c) giving equivalents of weights and measures;
   d) providing information on plays on words;
   e) including supplementary data on proper names.
2. to add information which may be generally useful in understanding the historical and cultural background of the document in question.

Sadiq (2010) asserts that one of the advantages of footnotes is that these are placed on the same page, eliminating the risk that the reader will become exhausted or distracted by the need to browse through numerous pages to reach the explanatory notes.

2.9 Conclusion

To summarise, there is a long history of theoretical debates about the relative merits of literal and free translation. Some scholars prefer the literal translation method, while others criticise this approach on the grounds that it may not convey the intended meaning of the source language, in contrast to the free translation approach, which is more equipped to transfer the original text's contextual meaning into the target language. The chapter has described how, as a result of these debates, a number of authors in the second half of the twentieth century began to produce works focusing on the techniques and strategies that can be employed by translators to overcome or mitigate the problems encountered in translation and enable them to avoid word-for-word translation and so reduce a potential loss of meaning. In particular, it proposes that Newmark's (1995) semantic and communicative translation theory, and the exegetic translation method of Dickins et al. (2002), can be useful when translating culturally specific collocations in the Quran: the strategies advanced by these theoretical models allow the translator to approximate the meaning of the collocations and convey this to the target readership.

The chapter has particularly highlighted the issue of translation loss, explaining the reasons behind it and how to minimise it in the translation process. The translation techniques and strategies discussed above can help translators acquire an understanding of the discipline and apply this to their work in such a way as to reduce loss of meaning during the translation process. Arguably, however, Newmark (1995) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1995: 1958) could have analysed these procedures more critically by referring to some of their disadvantages as well. The cultural-borrowing technique addressed by Vinay and Darbelnet, and Dickins et al. is, in itself, insufficient for the task of conveying the intended message of the text from the source language into the target language. In other words, translators may also need to combine paraphrasing or some other technique alongside cultural borrowing in order to convey the message clearly. For example, the Quranic collocations '*al-masjid al-ḥarām*' and '*al-masjid al-ʾaqṣa'* are cultural borrowings, but if these names appear in the target text in this way some readers may be confused as they are not familiar with them. Therefore, additional information, such as 'in Mecca' and 'in Jerusalem', is essential to contextualise the implicit meaning. The main question is, however, which of these translation techniques and strategies are most relevant to the translation of Quranic collocations?

Chapter Three
Translation of the Quran

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a background to the translation of the Quran, focusing on the text as divine revelation and addressing certain features of the type of Arabic in which it is written. It also discusses the Quran's inimitability and how this affects attempts at translation. In relation to this, it highlights some of the unique features of the Quran, including its stylistic structure, and introduces the debates over its translation that continue to preoccupy Islamic scholars and Quranic translators, who often hold opposing views on how the sacred text should be rendered in other languages. The chapter also discusses the various issues that arise when attempting to translate the Quran, with the focus on cultural (contextual) problems, linguistic difficulties, including lexical and syntactic issues, and semantic problems, including metonymy and metaphor. It also investigates the often-overlooked question of how a translator's ideology (whether explicit or unacknowledged) can affect the translation of the Quran, and related to this, the role of *tafsīr* or interpretation in rendering the text comprehensible but true to its meaning in another language, and concludes by analysing different approaches to Quranic translation.

3.2 **The Quran as divine revelation**

According to Islamic tradition, the Quran is the word of Allah as revealed to the Prophet Mohammed through the medium of the Arabic language. Muslims consider it to be a book of guidance that teaches human beings how to live and how to worship their creator. As Seyyed Naser explains:

> This book to Islam, was revealed by Gabriel to the Prophet during the twenty-three years of his prophetic mission on different occasions during night and day, in both Makkah and Madinah, in such a manner that, although the words of the Quran came out of his mouth, its Author is God. (Seyyed Naser, 2015, xviii)

Following its revelation to Mohammed, the Quran was transmitted, first verbally and then in writing, by people known as *tawātar* or interpreters (Von Denffer, 1994). Some scholars, in

fact, believe that the word 'Quran' is derived from the root '*qara'*' (to read or recite). Robinson observes that:

> [T]he Arabic word Quran is derived from *qara'* which means 'to read' but also has the connotation of 'to recite' or 'to proclaim'. According to tradition, the first part of the Quran to be revealed was the beginning of Surah 96, the first word of which is *iqra*, 'read or recite'. (Neal Robinson, 2003, 9)

Muslims believe that the Quran was not revealed to the Prophet until he was forty, although he had previously shown signs of prophetic abilities. According to Abdel-Malek Ibn Hisham (1996), one of Mohammed's wives, Aīsha, related that whatever Mohammed dreamt came true. He often sought solitude, leaving his wife, Khadija, in order to go to the cave of Hira, where he spent time in contemplation. One day, while he was in the cave, Jibrīl (the archangel Gabriel) appeared before him at Allah's command and ordered him to read. When Mohammed replied that he was unable to, Jibril embraced him tightly. Ibn Hisham (1996) states that Jibril ordered Mohammed to read three times, but he was unable to respond. After this, Jibril said (Surah 96: 1):

> Read! In the name of your Lord who created: He created man from a clinging form. Read! Your Lord is the Most Bountiful One who taught by (means of) the pen, who taught man what he did not know. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004)

Thus, after Mohammed had read the five verses, Jibril left. This is considered to be the first revelation of the Quran. Mohammed returned to Khadija and told her what had happened. Taking this to be proof of her husband's prophethood, she went to her cousin, Ibn Nawful, a Christian who was also familiar with Jewish scriptures, and spoke to him about her husband's visitation. He responded by saying that if this was true, then Mohammed had been visited by Jibrīl, like Musa (Moses) before him, and was therefore the prophet of the nation.

According to Jalal Al-Din Al-Suyuti (2004),and Ibn Kathir (1997), the Quran was first sent down from heaven as a single text inscribed on a tablet on the 'Night of Power' ('*Laylatul-Qadr*') in the month of Ramadan, and then gradually revealed to Mohammed over a period of twenty-three years. As Surah 2: 185 and Surah 97: 1 proclaim:

> 'Ramadan is the month in which was sent down the Quran as a guide to mankind' (Ali, 1934: 2002)

> ‘Verily, We have sent it (the Quran) down in the Night of Al-Qadr (the Night of the Decree)’ (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

3.3 The Arabic of the Quran

Saleh Al-Fawzan (2002) observes that Allah gave miraculous powers to His prophets so that they would be accepted as His messengers. These powers were associated with the nations from which they originated. For example, Moses’ people, the Jews, were known for their magic and so he performed miracles that included turning his staff into a snake, transforming a healthy hand into a shinning white one and then making it whole again, and parting the Red Sea. Since their magicians were unable to challenge him, the people accepted Moses as a prophet. Similarly, at the time of Jesus, it was common to use herbal medicines to treat illnesses; however, Jesus’s medical abilities surpassed those of other practitioners and he was also able to bring the dead back to life by God’s grace. In the same way, Al-Fawzan argues, the Quran was Muhammed’s miracle for the Muslims since, at that time, the Arabs were noted for their eloquence and poetry. The Quran was the evidence they needed that Mohammed was a prophet.

According to Ibn Hisham (1996), Mohammed lived in Mecca, where the Qurayshi tribe was considered the most eloquent of all the Arab tribes; they were famed for their poetry and their linguistic prowess. Naser states:

> [A]ccording to many Muslim authorities, the prominence of the linguistic arts in pre-Islamic Arabia was among the reasons that the language of the Quran was chosen by God to be miraculous […] [T]he eloquence (*balāghah*) of the Quran is in fact considered to be miraculous (*muʿjizah*) and beyond the possibility of imitation by any human being. (Naser, 2015, xxv)

Despite the fact that the Quran was composed in Arabic, using the language that the Qurayshi and other Arab tribes were familiar with, when Allah challenged them to reproduce its linguistic expression, they were unable to – and this challenge remains unanswered, as is seen in Surah 52: 34, which says, ‘Let them produce one like it, if what they say is true’ (Abdel-Haleem, 2004). The Qurayshi tribe were astonished by the Arabic found in the Quran and were incapable of matching its unique discourse. According to Abdel-Haleem (1999), the Quran, therefore, was recited first to those Arabs whose paramount gift was the eloquence of their speech, who possessed a rich and elaborate literature, and who were especially famed for their poetry. Mohammed’s followers and opponents alike recognised the Quran’s literary

supremacy and inimitability. His opponents in Mecca were unable to rise to the challenge of reproducing a literary work that was equivalent to the Quran. Of these, Alwalid Ibn Al-Mughīra was considered to be the most influential among the members of the Quraysh tribe and the most eloquent, but when he heard the Quran, he was in awe of the power of its language and described it thus: 'It ascends to the heights and nothing ascends above it, and it crushes what is beneath it' (Abdel-Haleem, 1999, 8).

The Quran is considered the core text for all Islamic topics, as well as for Arabic linguistic studies. As Dickins asserts:

> Classical Arabic displays a fundamental linguistic stability from the pre-Islamic period to the modern era. This is underpinned by the centrality of the Quran and Quranic language in Arabic linguistic thinking and the essentially prescriptive approach of traditional Arabic grammar, the fundamental rationale for which was to serve the reading and interpretation of the Quran. (Dickins, 2010, 1077)

According to Abdel-Haleem (2004), the Quran was the starting point for all the Islamic sciences: the evolution of Arabic grammar originated in the wish to serve the Quran; the study of Arabic phonetics was developed in order to determine the exact pronunciation of Quranic words; the science of Arabic rhetoric emerged from the need to describe the features of the unique style of the Quran; and the art of Arabic calligraphy was developed by writing down the Quran. Furthermore, the Quran became the foundation of Islamic law and theology. Al-Suyūṭī said, 'everything is based on the Quran' (Abdel-Haleem (2004, ix).

Colin Turner (2013), Seyyed Naser (2015) and Muhammad Asad (2008) analyse the language of the Quran from a linguistic perspective. According to Turner (2013, xiii), 'the Quran is written in a language wholly divergent in syntax and structure from any other, with its own unique nuances and metaphorical uses of words'. Naser (2015) asserts that the Arabic language of the Quran is sometimes figurative, sometimes anagogical, and at yet other times expresses the intention of the author. Asad, meanwhile, highlights the difficulties involved in understanding Quranic Arabic:

> [As] the Arabic of the Quran is a language which attained its full maturity in the Arabia of fourteen centuries ago, it follows that in order to grasp its spirit correctly, one must be able to feel and hear this language as the Arabs felt and heard it at the time when the Quran was being revealed, and to understand the meaning which they gave to the linguistic symbols in which it is expressed. (Asad, 2008, 5)

For this reason, all of the above authors argue that the Quran often gives rise to difficulties for the contemporary reader when it comes to understanding its language and meaning, as well as its syntax, and this may be attributed to the fact that the text includes classical Arabic words that cannot be understood by present-day native Arabic speakers. A further reason, however, is that the Quran's Arabic syntax often appears to be unique, and as some verses also imply historical and situational background information, translators need to be acquainted with both Quranic exegetical works and Arabic syntax in order to to comprehend the deep and often ambiguous meanings of the sacred text.

3.4 The unique features of Quranic Arabic

The most prominent feature of the Quran is its *iʿjāz* (inimitability). In theological terms, the concept of '*iʿjāz*' refers to the divine and miraculous origins of the Quran, meaning that no human being can reproduce its unique qualities – it is said that Allah challenged any man to create language such as that found in the Quran – with the consequent implication that the translation of the Quran into other languages could be considered impossible. As Abdul-Raof (2006) notes, the word '*iʿjāz*' in etymological terms is a nominal noun derived from the transitive verb '*aʿjaza*', meaning to render someone unable to do something, and from a morphological perspective, it is also related to the word '*muʿjizah*' (miracle).

According to Farid Esack (1993), the most common aesthetic basis for the inimitability of the Quran is its literary form (*an-nuẓum*) and rhetorical style (*balāghah*). Al-Jurjani (1995, cited in Vasalou, 2002, 39) defines '*an-nuẓum*' as 'attaching words to each other and making some [words] causes for others, according to the principles of grammar and syntax'. Abdul-Raof (2006, 98) considers that 'the order system (*an-nuẓum*) is a grammar-based linguistic notion that refers to the various orders of sentence constituents for different communicative functions'. Therefore, these words and sentences are grammatically associated or 'chained together', creating a unique style. Al-Fred Guillaume (1990, 73-74), on the other hand, highlights the uniqueness of the Quran's phonetic system, which has 'a rhythm of peculiar beauty and a cadence that charms the ear [...] It is this quality it possesses of silencing criticism by the sweet music of its language that has given birth to the dogma of its inimitability.' Abdul-Raof (2003, 401) refers to Pickthall (1930: 1969, vii), who describes the Quran as 'an inimitable symphony, the very sounds of which move men to tears and ecstasy'. Abdul-Raof claims that this euphony (or cadence) has a particular psychological effect on those reciting or hearing the Quran.

Othman Almisned (2001, 48-49) reports that some scholars, such as al-Mawardi (364-450) and al-Baqalany (338-402), (a scholar of Arabic eloquence), agree on the following reasons why the Quran is inimitable:

> 1. 'The correctness of the words of a type beyond the capacity of the Arabs. In spite of their extraordinary skills in the language, the Arabs could not produce anything like it;
> 2. The brilliant harmony and marvellous style of the Quran, no matter what subject it deals with;
> 3. The fact that Arabic diction never had such eloquence in expressing delicate ideas and rare truths in a unique style;
> 4. The wide range of topics in the Quran, including stories, admonitions, arguments, facts, laws, patterns, promises, instructions about the past and future, and descriptions of various things;
> 5. The fact that the construction of the Quranic patterns highlights three particular features: the effective and impressive use of words; the fullness of ideas that 'are clearly at the beginning and not dependent at the end'. Also there is harmony between ideas and thoughts; and the beauty of its construction and absence of inharmonious combinations;
> 6. The existence of different means of expression: detailed explanations, myths, disjunctions, conjunctions and metaphors, among other things. All these are found in the Quran and if they are compared with ordinary people's language usage, 'it becomes apparent that the expressions of the Quran are superhuman' Almisned (2001, 48-49).

Abdel-Haleem, meanwhile, focuses on one of the stylistic feature of the Quran, which is referred to in Arabic as '*iltifāt*':

> One of the obvious stylistic features of the Quran is the use of grammatical shifts from one personal pronoun to another (e.g. third to second to first person speaker; from singular to plural of majesty), and in the tenses of verbs. This is an accepted rhetorical practice in Arabic, similar to features used in some European literature. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004, xx)

One of other unique feature of the Quran is the structure of its single words. According to Abdel-Raof (2001, 46-47), some single words in the Quran are equivalent to complete

grammatical patterns in English. He illustrates this with examples from Surahs Hud (28), Al-Hijir (22) and A-Baqarah (The Cow) (137):

> *ʾAnulzimukumūhā* = Shall we compel you to accept it
> *Faʾasqaynākumūhu* = (We) give it you to drink
> *Fasayakfīkahumu* = But God will suffice thee against them

Abdel-Raof asserts that these Quranic single-word grammatical patterns represent syntactic voids in English. Abdel-Haleem also comments:

> [A]n important feature of the Quranic style is that it alludes to events without giving their historical background. Those who heard the Quran at the time of its revelation were fully aware of the circumstances but later generations of Muslims had to rely on the body of literature explaining the circumstances of the revelations (*asbab al-nuzūl*), and on explanations and commentaries based on the written and oral records of statements by eyewitnesses. (Abdel-Haleem 2004, xxii)

It could be argued that the events and parables that lie hidden within the structure of the Quran should not be literally translated, and the translator should rely instead on free translation and on consulting exegetical books in order to transfer (through approximation) their deeper meaning to the target readership. Free translation renders the sense and is able to go further and adding more information about the source text. The most important feature of this approach is to allow the translator to use other strategies such as paraphrase, explanatory note and footnote, and commentaries to convey the message of the source text suitably to the target audience. For example, Abdel-Raof (2001, 142) states that historical names in the Quran, such as the Thamud peoples or the Ad peoples, need to be illuminated with the use of footnotes.

To conclude, scholars such as Abdel-Raof (2006), Al-Baqalani, al-Mawardi and Guillaume (1990), Vasalou (2002), and others agree that the Quran possesses unique features and, as such, Quranic translators will never be able to reproduce its distinct and inimitable style. It may be possible to translate and interpret the meaning of the Quran but there will be an inevitable loss of meaning, and its prototypical features cannot be rendered into any other language. Hence, the reader of the translated text will lose the enjoyment that comes with reading the original text. In fact, there is a huge difference between a human project and a

sacred one: the Arabic Quran can have a profound influence not only on humankind but also on the objects of the natural world. As it says in Surah 59: 21:

> If We had sent this Quran down to a mountain, you (the Prophet) would have seen it humbled and split apart in its awe of God. We offer people such illustrations so that they may reflect. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004)

3.5 The Quran as (un)translatable

The debates concerning the translation of the Quran first emerged centuries ago and it remains a controversial issue among Islamic scholars and translators to this day. Some believe that the Quran should not be translated at all because it includes the words of Allah, revealed in a specific form of Arabic, and its meaning might be distorted if it is translated into other languages. However, other scholars believe that the Quran needs to be translated as a way of interpreting its meaning so that it can serve as an effective *daʿwa* (teaching) for non-Arabic-speaking Muslims and non-Muslims, encouraging them to learn about Islam in their own language and helping them understand its message.

Muslim cleric Imam Al-Shafiʿi (767-820 CE) (cited in Al-Fawzan, 2002, 23), however, stated that every Muslim should learn as much Arabic as possible so that he or she would be able to declare that there is no God but Allah and 'Mohammed is his slave and messenger' and to recite the Quran in the obligatory prayers that 'glorify and bear witness to Allah'. Imam Al-Nawawi (1234-1277 CE) (cited in Al-Fawzan, 2002) was of the same opinion: namely, that Islamic doctrine does not permit the reading or reciting of the Quran – in prayer or any other activity – in any language other than Arabic, as such a prayer would not be accepted whether or not the reading was faithful to the Quran. This opinion has been confirmed by other imams such as Malik, Ibn Hanbal and Dawood. In the introduction to his translation of the Quran, Pickthall (1938:1930, I) appears to concur, stating that 'the Quran cannot be translated'. He argues that his translation cannot replace the original Quran and is only intended to represent its meaning in English. Arthur Arberry (1980), Asad (1980) and Thomas Irving (1985) agree with Pickthall that the Quran has unique features and is, in this sense, untranslatable. Asad (1980) believes that the Quran is different from other books, particularly as its linguistic features and meanings are unique, and so it cannot be translated in the same way as, for instance, Plato or Shakespeare, while Irving (1985) relates that each time he returns to the Arabic text, he finds new meanings and new ways to interpret it.

It is possible that one of the reasons why some Muslim scholars oppose the translation of the Quran is that, in the past, some non-Muslim translators have attempted to distort the image of Islam in their rendering of this sacred text. Turner (2013) notes that early English translations of the Quran by Redwell (1563-1632) and Sales (1734) were used to express anti-Islamic sentiments. Palmer's translation of the Quran (1880) also failed due to his rendering of the Quran into colloquial English which misrepresented the Arabic of the original text. This apparent failure led Muslim writers such as Ali, Pickthall and Asad to take up the challenge of producing successful English translations. Turner emphasises that as the Quran was revealed through the medium of Arabic, any translation of this text is an interpretation of its meaning and inevitably entails the loss of some of that meaning:

> The general consensus among Muslim scholars – including those who have attempted translations of the Quran into other languages – is that the Quran is ultimately untranslatable. Of course, to say that the Quran is untranslatable is not to say that it should never be translated. What one must bear in mind when rendering a translation of the Quran, however, is that what is lost in translation is the Quran itself. (Turner, 2013, xiii)

Turner (2013, x) maintains that the Quran has two levels of untranslatability: 'the aesthetic-linguistic and [the] religio-philosophical'. The former refers to the unique structure of the Quran – its style, syntax and *an-nuẓum* (ordering system), as well as its semantic and phonetic features – while the latter refers to the contextual meanings of the Quran, including its cultural and situational meanings. Toury (1980, 49) also explains that 'no translation [of the Quran] is entirely acceptable or entirely adequate'. However, like many other scholars, Turner believes that although the unique features of the Quran cannot be copied into another language, a translation of its meaning is possible.

Abdel-Jalil Abdel-Rahim (1981, 546-551) argues there are many reasons why it is impossible to translate the Quran into other languages by using word-for-word or semantic translations. Firstly, there are some near-synonymous terms, each of which has a slightly different meaning, and this poses difficulties for translators attempting to convey the intended meaning of these verses in other languages. For example, the Quran uses a number of terms to refer to the 'Last Day' or 'Day of Judgement', including '*al-wāqiʿah*', '*al-ḥāqqah*', '*al-qāriʿah*', '*aṭ-ṭāmmah*' and '*aṣ-ṣākhah*'. Abdel-Rahim maintains that the disagreements among Muslim scholars about the exact meaning of some of these synonyms in the Arabic itself serves to highlight the impossibility of transferring such words to other languages. Ibn

Kutaibah (1981, 21) agrees with Abdel-Rahim that none of the translations of the Quran can be accurate because Arabic language is much richer in figurative language than any other language. Abdul-Raof also argues that the Quran is untranslatable:

> [W]hen the best of Arab poets, rhetoricians, linguists, etc., of a linguistically homogenous community of the time failed, one wonders how a bilingual/bicultural individual can succeed in reproducing an equivalent 'Quran' in a language which is both culturally and linguistically incongruous to Arabic. (Abdul-Raof, 2001, 39)

Some Muslim scholars, on the other hand, have adopted a different point of view, arguing that the Quran is translatable in so far as it is possible to interpret and transmit its meaning into other languages. Ibn Taimiya (2001, 5: 25), in his *Majmūʿt al-fatāwa*, states that 'it is permitted to translate the meaning of the Quran just as this is allowed for Tafsir [interpretation] of the Quran'. He emphasises that 'translation of the Quran is permitted for those who do not understand Arabic and speak other languages such as Farsi, Turkish, and Roman' (2001, 8: 205). Al-Qurtubi (2006, 1: 27) agrees that 'interpretation and explanation of the meaning of the Quran is authorized by unanimity'. Al-Fawzan (2002) states that some scholars like Mohammed Al-Muraghy, who was Sheikh of Al-Azhar from 1928 to 1930, and Mohammed Wajdi (1878-1954), an Islamic writer, held that the Quran can be translated semantically, in support of their claim that the call to Islam is not intended for only one specific nation but for all people. They note that this universal call may have to be based on translations of the Quran because many people are not familiar with Arabic and it is not necessary to oblige them to learn the language. Al-Muraghy and Wajdi also point to the fact that as early translations of the Quran frequently contained numerous errors, accurate new versions are needed to rectify these mistakes. Moreover, since reading the Quran during prayers is obligatory for all Muslims, it should be translated for those who do not speak Arabic so that their prayers will be accepted. These scholars report that Abu Hanifa allowed the Quran to be read in Fārisi during prayers, and when Al- Zamakhshary interpreted verse 196 of Surah Ash-Shu'ara, he argued that this supports Abu Hanifa's authorisation: 'And verily, it [the Quran], and its revelation to Prophet Muhammed is [announced] in the scripture (i.e. the *Taurat* [Torah] and the *Injeel* [Gospel]) of former people' (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996). According to Al-Fawzan (2002), Al-Muraghy and Wajdi conclude that although there are those who claim that mistakes always appear in translations of the Quran, these mistakes may also appear in the interpretation of the Quran in Arabic, but that is not forbidden.

Although Asad (1980) and Abdul-Raof (2001, 61) admit that it may not be possible to reproduce the original Quran, they later assert that it is possible to translate the sacred text. The former maintains that its message can be rendered intelligible to people who do not know the Arabic language at all, as is the case for most Westerners and even educated non-Arab Muslims. Such people would be unable to understand the whole Quran without assistance. Abdul-Raof points out that all the words of a particular language contain the ability to be translated if they are altered to make sense in the other language; that is, culturally specific terms can be paraphrased and semantic neologisms can be described in the target language. He suggests using exegetic translations with a paraphrase technique when translating Quranic words that are culturally specific and/or contain allegorical meanings. In his translation of the Quran, Abdel-Haleem (2010, cited in Aldahesh, 2014, 39) stresses that any rendering of the Quran 'is no more than an interpretation or form of exegesis to attempt to explain, in the target language, what the Arabic says [and] like any human endeavour, all translations are open to improvements'. He observes that translation of the Quran is based on the interpretation and elucidation of its meaning, and that this will always entail a loss of that meaning. However, it does not follow that it should not be attempted.

Given that the Quran contains many culturally specific words, the exegetic translation approach is the most suitable for approximating the connotative meaning of these words and rendering them into English. Although most Muslim scholars and translators agree that the Quran is fundamentally untranslatable due to its linguistic and cultural specificity, and to the fact that the Arabic Quran is considered to be a divine revelation while translations are human creations, they also maintain that it can be rendered into the target language as a means of interpreting and illuminating its meaning. Overall, there is no real evidence to prevent or forbid translation of the Quran: there is no hadith or any verse in the Quran supporting this claim. According to the Quran, Mohammed has been sent to all peoples, not only to the Arabs, and this fact appears to point to the possible need for translations of the Quran to help non-Arabic-speaking Muslims and non-Muslims gain knowledge of Islam and its sacred book, and to educate those who intend to convert to the religion.

According to Lyyne Long (2005, 15), 'holy text translation must be possible because it is happening. Whether it is permitted or not, it is necessary and difficult and will never be satisfactory to anyone.' The author notes that 'translated texts of all kinds, and particularly holy texts, have helped to shape cultures throughout history' (2005, 2). Therefore, I would argue that the Quran can be translated by interpreting its meaning and explaining this in the

target language. However, using a literal translation method to render the Quran into another language may distort its culturally specific meaning and cause ambiguity; it is better for translators to use a method of free translation when tackling the allegorical and figurative language of the Quranic text as this approach does not adhere to the SL word order. Rather it concentrates on cultural and situational context in the source language and helps convey its implicit and cultural meanings into the target language. This approach sometimes requires use techniques and strategies such as footnote, paraphrase, explanatory note, shifting, and descriptive and functional equivalenc, and therefore the translator is at liberty to use any techniques with free translation to convey and approximate the meaning approprly to the target audience.

3.6 The Quran's translational challenges

The translation of the Quranic text into English can pose significant challenges for translators because, as we have seen, it is a sacred text that includes unique linguistic features and cultural concepts. This highly specific language creates difficulties for translators attempting to grasp the intended meaning of these lexical items. According to Abdul-Raof:

> The Quran was revealed in an Arab context of culture that is entirely alien to a target language (TL) audience outside the Arab peninsula. Thus, we encounter Quranic-specific cultural expressions as well as Quran specific linguistic patterns that cannot be domesticated by the TL linguistic norms. (Abdul-Raof, 2005, 162)

When translating texts, some of the most challenging problems are often the result of differences in the linguistic structures and cultural contexts of the source language and the target language. John Catford (1965) and Mohammad Al-Khawalda (2004) categorise such translation difficulties as two types: linguistic and cultural. These occur when the source language features an item or a text that has no equivalent in the target language. Khawalda adds textual and situational types of translation difficulties, a problem that arises when situational and cultural features found in the source text are completely absent from the target language, and advises that these factors should also be taken into consideration. In these instances, the translator has to decide how to reduce translation loss by approximating the original meaning. As Nida and de Waard (1986, cited in Venuti, 1995, 21) point out, 'the translator must be a person who can draw aside the curtains of linguistic and cultural differences so that people may see clearly the relevance of the original message'.

The Quran embeds pragmatic and cultural meanings as well as historical and social background within its verses. Hence, translators should not only be aware of the Arabic syntax of the Quran but they also need an understanding and knowledge of its *tafsīr* (interpretation), as well as the occasions of revelation in the Quran (*asbāb an-nuzūl*). Some verses in the Quran have been set down purely for the purpose of clarifying the concepts of *sharīʿa* and monotheism, or to narrate parables and describe the attributes of paradise and hell; however, other verses offer interpretations of and commentaries on specific events. An awareness of such occasions and the reason why these verses are included in the Quran can help the translator to understand their importance and convey their message acceptably to the target readership by using the free translation method and avoiding literal translation. Abdel-Haleem (2004, xxxi) also cautions againsts the use of literal translation to convey Quranic discourse, saying that he usually avoids 'unnecessarily close adherence to the original Arabic structures and idioms [...] because literal translations of Arabic idioms often result in meaningless English'. As Von Denffer states:

> [A] word-by-word translation of the Quran into another language would not be adequate. Therefore, good translators have always aimed at first determining the meaning of a passage and then rendering it into the other language. Hence translations of the Quran are actually expressions of meanings of the Quran in other languages. (Von Denffer, 1994, 113)

Similarly, Roman Loimeier (2005) argues that linguistic analysis of the Quran should be based on the interpretation of the meaning, and those scholars who have linguistic skills in Arabic should translate the Quran as a text with a contextualised message. Irving (1985, xxiv) also comments that translation of the Quran literally is 'impossible'; he elaborates further, commenting that 'the Quran is a living book. We must respect yet find a way to interpret this sacred text, and not deform its meaning.' Thus, as Abdal-Haleem, Irving and Denffer argue in the above discussion, literal translation of the Quran may distort the intended meaning of some of its lexical items, particularly as this approach does not take into consideration the other aspects mentioned by Khawalda, Catord and Abdel-Raof, such as the textual, cultural and situational features of the text. For this reason, free translation is a more appropriate method for the translator to adopt since it focuses on the meaning and attempts to explain the message of the Quran. This approach allows the translator to use different procedures, such as paraphrasing, footnotes, cultural borrowing, addition, transposition and compensation – all

strategies that can help illuminate and approximate the ambiguous meaning to the target audience.

It is likely, however, that translators will face major difficulties in understanding the language and underlying meaning of the lexical items that occur in the Quran. For example, the word '*jihād*' has three or four connotative meanings depending on the context in which the term is used, and can be associated variously with speech, weapons, money-giving or deeds, all meanings that are sometimes missing in translation. For example, in his translation of Surah 25: 52, Pickthall translates '*jihād*' literally as 'to strive', without referencing any of the connotative meanings which might be understood from the English term 'fighting':

> *falā tuṭiʿ al-kāfirīna wa jāhidhum bihi jihādan kabīra*
> 'So, obey not the disbelievers, but strive against them herewith with a great endeavour'. (Pickthall, 1930)

Ibn Khathir (1997, 3: 285), Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 606) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 15: 450) comment that the term '*jihād*' means here that Allah is commanding the Prophet Mohammed to strive to convince disbelievers to learn about the Quran. Al-Razi (1995, 12, 101) reports that some scholars believe that this means literally 'fighting against' disbelievers, but he argues that this not the sense of the term as it is used in this context. This is because the surah dates from Mohammed's time in Mecca, and the Prophet and his followers only took up the command to fight against disbelievers after their emigration to Medina.

The above discussion shows how problematic translation can be and has briefly underlined some of the challenges. A more detailed discussion of the cultural and linguistic problems that translators face when rendering the Quran from Arabic into English follows in the next section.

3.6.1 Cultural problems

Many scholars have argued that cultural items create some of the most difficult problems in the whole translation process, particularly when there are major differences between the cultures where the source language and the target language are spoken, as language and culture cannot be separated. According to Nida (2001, 27), therefore, 'language represents the culture because the words refer to the culture'. Bassnett describes this interrelationship between language and culture, and its implications for the translator, thus:

> Language, then, is the heart within the body of culture, and it is the interaction between the two that results in the continuation of life-energy. In the same way that the surgeon, operating on the heart, cannot neglect the body that surrounds it, so the translator treats the text in isolation from the culture at his peril. (Bassnett, 2014, 25)

This highlights the importance of taking into account the cultural element in the translation process. Newmark (1995, 94) defines culture 'as the way of life and its manifestations that are peculiar to a community that uses a particular language as its means of expression', observing that when there is a focus on cultural phenomena, translation problems surface due to the cultural 'gap' or 'distance' between the source and target languages. He argues that words frequently reflect particular customs that are prevalent in a specific culture, noting that the traditional English focus on sport, notably cricket, has produced otherwise incomprehensible terminology such as 'a maiden over','silly mid-on' and 'howzat', and in a similar way, the French focus on wine and cheese, the German on sausages, the Spanish on bull fighting, the Arabic on camels and the Inuit on snow produce particular and seemingly untranslatable cultural terms. Nida (2000, cited in Saudi Sadiq, 2010, 37) agrees that culture causes 'many more severe complications for the translator than do differences in language structure'. An example of how these cultural differences impact language can be seen in Arabic: when there is good news, a person will commonly say 'the news chilled my heart' while English speakers refer to 'heart-warming news', showing that feeling cold has a positive connotation in an Arabic-speaking environment in which the weather can be unpleasantly hot while heat carries positive connotations in English, particularly in Britain where the weather is predominantly cool.

'Culture' is in fact a very broad term that embraces many different aspects of knowledge, and translators must first recognise any cultural allusions in the source language and then consider how to find a cultural equivalent in the target language. Aljabari (2008) explains that the processing of transferring cultural elements from the source language into the target language is a difficult but essential task, because the concept of culture includes a set of complicated experiences relating to social structure, history, customs and beliefs, as well as the practices of everyday life. The process of transmitting these cultural elements through translation is, as Aljabri says, a delicate task because a cultural context comprises a complex collection of experiences that are impossible for any translator, no matter how familiar with that culture, to completely understand. Therefore, a literal translation will

necessarily distort the meaning of the given text, and an appropriate translation may need to include descriptive functional equivalents. Ritva Leppihalme (1997, 21) further emphasises the difficulties facing the translator when translating the cultural meaning of a text, commenting that 'culture-bound concepts, even where [the] two cultures involved are not too distant, can be more problematic for the translator than the semantic or syntactic difficulties of a text'.

Abdul-Raof (2005, 164) discusses examples of instances where the denotative meaning of some words is identical in both cultures but their connotative meaning is completely different. These include words such as '*kalb*' (dog), *'būmah*' (owl), *ḥimār'* (donkey) and '*ḥida*' (shoe), which all have negative connotative meanings in Arab cultures and can be used as major insults. The dog, for example, is considered to be an unclean animal, and according to Islamic *sharīʾa*, a Muslim's prayers will not be accepted if a dog touches his or her clothes. The word '*kalb*' is also used as an offensive expression in Arabic ('son of a dog'), while the owl carries the connotation of stupidity and is considered a bird of ill omen. Similarly, the donkey denotes extreme stupidity while shoes are viewed as dirty objects and are associated with showing disrespect. However, the same words carry a different set of associations in English, many of them positive. As such, the dog is often described as 'man's best friend' and is used to symbolise loyalty, while the owl is characterised as a symbol of wisdom as well as one of ill omen. The word 'shoe', however, is neutral, with neither positive nor negative undertones, and although donkeys are also used in English – in a similar way to the Arabic – to signify stupidity (as well as obstinacy), they are also seen as loveable creatures. An example of this is the popularity of the Elisabeth Svendsen Trust for Children and Donkeys (EST), with branches located in Leeds, Birmingham and Sidmouth, which adopts abandoned or mistreated donkeys and cares for them. As these examples show, translators need to be aware of the different connotative associations words can carry when translating from Arabic into English, and vice versa. Thus, if someone from a Western culture writes of the wisdom possessed by a particular person from an Arab culture, they need to avoid referring to them as an owl; rather, the message they wish to convey needs to be rendered in a culturally sensitive way, calling them, for example, 'a wise man'. Using a literal translation for this term may distort the intended meaning and cause offence. For this reason, free translation may often represent a more suitable approach when conveying a message from the source language into the target language.

The translator's task is even more problematic when it involves religious cultural meanings that are open to interpretation. In these cases, the translator must attempt to grasp the intended meaning of the source language and convey it clearly in the target language by using a range of different techniques. According to Bakri Al-Azzam et al.

> Since language is an integrated part of the culture that expresses it, translators should not deal with it in isolation from culture. In Quranic discourse, the divine text reflects some social activities of Arabs in the pre-Islamic period; the expressions that denote such social acts and events are hard to fully obtain in translation because of their cultural idiosyncrasies. (Al-Azzam et al., 2015, 29)

Al-Azzam and his co-authors conducted a comparative analysis of the methods used for translating the culturally specific meanings of elements of the Quranic text, focusing on three translations of the Quran by Pickthall (1930: 1953), Ali (1934: 2006), and Al-Hilali and Khan (1974: 1996). The first example is taken from Surah Al-Takwir (81: 8):

> *waʾidhā l-mawʾudatu suʾilat*

The authors state that the Arabic expression '*al-mawʾudatu*' refers to the ancient Arab custom of burying a female infant alive, an inhuman act that was practised by both fathers and mothers alike (2015, 31). As Ibn Atyah and Ibn Al-Jawzi (1991: 1987, cited in Al-Azzam et al., 2015) explain, pre-Islamic Arabs were essentially deeply rooted in their tribal cultures, with their associated customs and traditions. These tribes were often involved in disputes, particularly over the control of scarce water resources or grasslands, and this led to a situation of endless war. It is in this context that some tribes at the time practised this type of female infanticide, which is said to reflect a fear that the girls might be captured or violated by the enemy, bringing shame to the tribe. Pickthall's translation, however, seems to imply that he was not aware of the socio-cultural dimension of this expression:

> And when the girl-child that was buried alive is asked […] (Pickthall, 1930: 1935)

According to Al-Azzam et al. (2015), Pickthall's translation does not refer to the exact age of the females in question, as the word 'child' implies someone older than an 'infant'. In contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan (1974: 1996), and Ali (1934: 2006) all clarify the meaning of the word '*al-mawʾudatu*', showing that they were aware of this aspect of Arab cultural history. However, their translations seem to generalise the idea of burying someone since Al-Hilali

and Khan's translation adds 'as the pagan Arabs used to do'. Ali also implies that infanticide applied to all female infants:

> And when the female (infant) buried alive (as the pagan Arabs used to do) is questioned […] (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> And when the female (infant), buried alive, is questioned […] (Ali, 1934: 2006)

Al-Azzam and his co-authors (2015) further comment on the translation of another example taken from Surah Quraysh (106: 2):

> *ʾīlāfihim riḥlatash-shitāʾi waṣ-ṣayf*
>
> For the covenants (of security and safeguard enjoyed) by the Quraish, their covenants (covering) journeys by winter and summer (Ali, 1934: 2002)

Here, these authors shed light on another Arab cultural tradition that emerged during the pre-Islamic era of trade: namely, that Qurayshi merchants used to travel to Yemen and Syria with caravans of goods, conducting business and earning huge profits. These caravans journeyed to Yemen in the winter when the climate was moderate and goods were in abundance, while in the summer they went to Syria, where the climate was temperate and goods were also plentiful. Al-Qurtubi (2003, cited in Al-Azzam et al., 2015, 33) states that '[t]he fact that trading among the tribe of Quraysh is deeply rooted in history is reflected in the verse *liʾīlāfi Quraysh ʾilāfihim* which clearly indicates that the tribe was accustomed to this summer-winter journey'. Azzam and his co-authors point out that problems arise with the literal translation of the Quranic collocation '*riḥlatash-shitāʾi waṣ-ṣayf*' into English as 'journeys by winter and summer', as the target readers may not have any background information about the form that the trade between these two destinations took. Consequently, as Asad (2008) argues, in order to understand the Quranic language of this passage, the translator needs to have a high degree of knowledge about the Arabic language used by the Quraysh tribe, as well as their historical social, political and economic life. Only then would the translator be able to grasp the cultural meaning of phrases or ambiguous words that refer to their economic and social activities or their history.

Sadiq (2010, 44-45) also provides an interesting example relating to the difficulties of translating culturally specific meanings in the Quran:

> *wa-lā tuṣaʿir khaddaka li-n-nāsi*

Do not turn your nose up at people (31:18)

According to Sadiq, the verb '*tuṣaʿir'* is culturally specific and cannot be easily understood or rendered into English unless the translator is fully aware of both the source and target cultures. Sadiq maintains that although Pickthall, Ali, Arberry, and Ghali translate the intended meaning of this verb, none of them clarify the connotation associated with this verse with the use of a footnote. They translate it variously as:

Turn not thy cheek in scorn toward folk (Pickthall, 1930: 1981)

And swell not thy cheek away haughtily from mankind (Ali, 1982)

Turn not thy cheek away from men in scorn (Arberry, 1983)

And do not turn your cheek away haughtily from mankind (Ghali, 2005)

Sadiq (2010) notes that Hifny (1992) explains that the verb '*tuṣaʿir*' relates to desert culture and derives from the noun '*a-ṣṣaʿr*', which refers to a disease affecting camels which causes their necks to twist. As a result, affected camels would walk with their chest in the normal position but with their neck twisting to the right or the left, in a comical fashion. Arabs at the time of Mohammed would have understood this verse as likening proud people to camels affected by *a-ṣṣaʿr*, walking around in what appeared to be a snobbish manner. According to Sadiq (2010), clarifying the image in translation is essential because this helps to elucidate the shades of meaning it contains and the rhetorical purpose it serves, as well as providing an insight into its cultural context. Translators need to be familiar with the cultural references contained in the Quran, and for this reason, exegeses are essential for interpreting meaning and reducing ambiguity or translation loss.

As noted above, translation of culturally related items is one of the most difficult tasks for translators, particularly when this involves very different cultures; these problems increase when attempting to render the cultural meanings underpinning the Arabic found in the Quran into English. Translators need an in-depth knowledge of the social and historical context that is reflected in the Quran if they are to find appropriate equivalents that can accurately convey its meaning into the target language. The next section, however, turns to focus on the linguistic problems facing translators when attempting to render the Quran into another language, and addresses the areas of lexis, syntax and semantics.

3.6.2 Linguistic problems

Besides the problems of culturally specific language, translators also face issues arising from the distinctive linguistic features of the Quran due to the fact that some of its syntactic, stylistic and structural features may have semantic implications of which they may be unaware. Translators also face the problem of finding equivalent English expressions for Islamic lexical terms and need to have an advanced knowledge of Arabic in order to be able to understand Quranic discourse and approximate its meaning in the target language. According to Loimeir (2005, 417) the difficulties of comprehending these linguistic features and their implicit meaning mean that 'a proper interpretation of the Quran should be confined to the *ʿulamāʾ* or those scholars who have the linguistic skills (in Arabic) to translate the Quran not only as a text but as a contextualized message'.

3.6.2.1 Lexical problems

Discussing the problems of translating Arabic lexical items into English, , Abdullah Shunnāq (1998) notes that it is difficult to find full equivalents in English for some terms in Arabic, and maintains that translators may have to try and find items in English that are partially equivalent. The following are some lexical examples from the Quran that are frequently translated into English as follows: '*taqwa*' (God-fearing), '*ṣaqar*' (hell), '*kufr*', '*shirk*' (disbelief, idolatry), '*tawbah*' (repentance), '*ḥaqq*' (truth), '*zakāt*' (almsgiving/dues owed to the poor), '*ṣawm*' (fasting), '*maʿrūf*' (charity), '*munkar*' (wrong), '*ghayb*' (the unseen/the unknown) '*sunnah*' (prophetic tradition), and '*ẓulm*' (oppression).

Abdul-Raof (2004, 94-95) states that the word '*taqwā'* has no English equivalent since it not only means to be in awe of God but also includes other spiritual aspects such as the love of God. Thus, he argues that the word '*muttaqīn*', a noun agent derived from '*taqwā*', is unsuitably rendered in Ali's (1938) translation of the Quran as 'those who fear God' in (Surah: 2) and elsewhere in the Quran in (surah: 128) as 'those who restrain themselves', and recommends instead transliterating this expression and using a periphrastic (exegetic) translation to reduce the loss of meaning. Abdul-Raof asserts that Al-Hilali and Khan (1983) adopt this approach, employing transliteration followed by a periphrastic translation: 'The pious and righteous persons who fear Allah much, abstain from all kinds of bad deeds which He has forbidden, and love Allah much, and perform all kinds of goods deeds which He has ordained.'

Sadiq (2010) also analyses Arberry's (1983) translation of '*muttaqīn*', observing that he renders it as 'the god-fearing'. After consulting several English dictionaries, Sadiq explains that the term implies not only the faithful worship of God by following religious rules, but also love for Him. Sadiq, therefore, approves of Arberry's translation of the term as 'the god-fearing' since he believes this implies the correct meaning. However, he criticises Arberry for writing 'god' with a lower-case first letter, on the grounds that it may refer to any deity, and also argues that 'god-fearing', as the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (1992) comment, is an old-fashioned term. Consequently, the intended meaning may still not be correctly or fully conveyed. Abdul-Raof's (2004) analysis of the translation of the word '*muttaqīn*' offers a helpful insight into the use of the methods of transliteration and periphrastic translation to translate difficult words in the Quran. These methods can help to raise awareness of such concepts among non-Arabic and non-Muslim readers. Herman (1993, 13) also endorses this approach, stating that 'if the syntactical and lexical features of the source and target languages differ, clarity requires that the sentences in the target language be completely recast'. Thus, Sadiq's (2010) suggestion of translating '*muttaqīn*' as 'God-fearing' (even with an upper-case letter) fails to elucidate the full meaning. Moreover, the English dictionaries that Sadiq referred to may not provide accurate meanings of Quranic terminology; specialist dictionaries of Quranic Arabic would be of more use when translating this terminology into English, although even these would not be sufficient on their own. Generally speaking, translation is not about how these words are rendered in dictionaries; rather, the process consists of rendering the meaning from the source into the target language in such a way that it is clearly intelligible to the readership.

Similarly, although the word '*maʿrūf*' is often translated into English as 'charity', its connotative meaning goes beyond this concept since it also implies 'advice for the sake of Islam', 'any kind of help', or 'good deeds', depending on the situation. 'Almsgiving' is different from the Islamic concept of '*zakāt',* since the former refers to giving money or goods to those in need as an act of charity. Abdul-Raof (2004) comments that Ali explains *zakāt* (a due owed to the poor) effectively in a brief footnote as 'a tax at a fixed rate in proportion to the worth of property, collected from the well-to-do and distributed among the poor Muslims'. However, this footnote can be criticised on the grounds that it omits to make the important point that *zakāt* is one of the five pillars of Islam. Moreover, according to the exegeses of Ibn Khathir (1997), Al-Tabari (1997), Al-Qurtubi (2006) and Al-Razi (1995), there are two types of *zakāt*: '*zakāt al-fiṭr*', which is a compulsory act that all Muslims must

perform at the end of Ramadan and before Eid prayers, and '*zakāt al-māl*' (money), which refers to a compulsory obligation placed on those who have a certain amount of wealth to pay part of this to those in need.

3.6.2.2 Syntactic problems

The many differences between Arabic and English syntax also pose problems when translating the Quran. Al-Khawalda (2004, 220-21) illustrates his discussion of these syntactical issues with reference to the example of the tense shift in the Arabic word '*kāna*' (a past copular verb) and in the English 'to be' in its past form. According to Al-Khawalda, the Arabic verb is used to express a habitual situation in the past, but it is rendered as if the action or situation is occuring in the present. The author notes that translators find it difficult to recognise this shift in the temporal and aspectual reading of '*kāna*' owing to the fact that it is hard to find a justification for it. He illustrates this point with some examples and back translations, and suggests some appropriate renditions:

> *thummaʾilayya marjiʿukum fa-ʾaḥkumu baynakum fī-mā kuntum fīhi takhtalifūn* (3:55)
>
> Then you all return unto me, and I will judge between you of matters wherein you dispute. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

In this case, Al-Khawalda suggests the use of 'wherein you used to dispute' instead of 'wherein you dispute'. Another example is the way the phrase '*wa lahum ʿadhābun ʾalīmun bima kānū yakdhibūna*' (2:10) has been rendered into English. Pickthall's translation, for instance, reads: 'A painful doom is theirs because they lie.' The back translation is 'because they are false' and the suggested one is 'because they used to lie' (Pickthall, 1930: 2002). Al-Khawalda (2004) observes that the text represents a warning from Allah to disbelievers which refers to their past habitual actions, and therefore the translator cannot render the last clause (in the first and second examples) into English by using the present tense because the context is the 'Last Day' or 'Day of Judgement'. Al-Khawalda states that, according to Islamic doctrine, on the Last Day everyone will be awaiting their fate, which they cannot change at this point, and so the verse means that on that day Allah will judge, for instance, the arguments that used to take place among people when they were in the world. Likewise, he explains that in the second example the translation fails to convey the original meaning: the disbelievers will be punished because they used to lie, not that they lie on the Day of Judgement.

The foregrounding or backgrounding of lexical items in the Quran is another syntactical problem facing translators due to their specific meaning. According to Abdul-Raof (2004, 96), 'these word orders are usually semantically oriented and their meaning is distinct from that of normal word order'. He illustrates this point with a discussion of an example from Ali's translation:

*wa-jaʿalū li-llāhi shurakāʾa l-jinna (*6: 100)

Yet they make the Jinns equals with God (Ali, 1934: 1983)

Abdul-Raof (2004) argues that the word '*al-jinna*' is taken out of its usual post-verbal position and placed at the end of the sentence, whereas '*li-llāhi*' (God) has been taken from its original final position and placed post-verbally to accomplish four important communication aims: firstly, for disapprobation of the unbelievers' actions; secondly, to condemn the association of jinns (spirits of a lower rank to angels) with God; thirdly, to bring to the readers' attention the notion of calumny that 'unbelievers' usually attribute to God; and lastly, maintaining the supreme status of God as Creator by foregrounding *li-llāhi* and placing it before *al-jinna*, illustrating the ordinary status of the jinns who, according to Al-Zayn (1985), Al-Zamakhshari (1995) and Al-Qurtubi (1997), are themselves beings created by Allah. Thus, Abdul-Raof states that the word order in the Quran can convey multiple meanings but Quranic translators, in most cases, do not realise this. Therefore, the Arabic language of the Quran is unique, and Ali appears to have realised that this verse (above) includes the foregrounding and backgrounding of lexical items, and in this sense, he conveys the message and its meaning adequately. However, it seems that he failed to recognise the purpose of the foregrounding and backgrounding within the verse.

As this discussion shows, the linguistic norms of the Quran can sound alien to the target readership, and so the translator needs to first understand the purpose of the syntactical elements before attempting to translate them, as they frequently imply very specific meanings.

3.6.2.3 Semantic problems

Translators may also encounter semantic problems when rendering the Quran into another language, with metaphors, polysemic words, collocations and metonyms all presenting particular challenges. In these instances, they need to consider the context of the text carefully if they are to translate its meaning appropriately.

a) Metonymy

One semantic problem that arises when attempting to render the Quran into English is the difficulty of grasping the intended meaning of its metonymy. Dan Fass (1997, 70) defines metonymy as 'a form of indirect reference in which one entity is used to stand for another entity closely associated with it'. For example, in Surah 38, there are two metonymies in verse 32: one is of a word mentioned in the verse that implies a metaphorical meaning, but the other metaphorical sense of the Surah needs to be grasped from the text as the word is not mentioned. In verse 31, the prophet Salomon is said to be preoccupied in watching a display of horsemanship during the day, and in verse 32, he blames himself for forgetting the evening prayer due to watching the exhibition till the sun set and night came (Ibn Kathir, 1997, 4: 31; Al-Tabari, 1997, 6: 401; Al-Qurtubi, 2006, 18: 193-94; Al-Razi, 1995, 13: 206). The implicit meaning of the word '*ḥijāb*' (veil), which is mentioned in the original text of the Quran, is 'night came'. However, the word 'sun' is a second metonymy, whose denotative has not been mentioned previously. The following example gives two different translations of the verse by Pickthall and Ali:

> *fa-qāla ʾinnī ʾaḥbabtu ḥubba l-khayri ʿan dhikri rabbī ḥattā tawārat bi-l-ḥijāb*
>
> And he said: Lo! I have preferred the good things (of the world) to the remembrance of my Lord; till they were taken out of sight behind the curtain. (Pickthall, 1930: 1983)
>
> And he said: Truly do I love the love of good, with a view to the glory of my Lord – until (the sun) was hidden in the veil (of night). (Ali, 1934: 1975)

On the one hand, Pickthall has built his analysis on this verse literally, as the first clause of the original Quran says, 'I loved the good things [these horses] rather than remembering my Lord' (my translation), and the second clause says, 'until [it] was hidden behind [a] *ḥijāb*'. It appears that Pickthall has encountered problems when trying to grasp the meaning of the two metonymies in the second clause as he uses the subject pronoun 'they' when in fact the metonymy has not been mentioned before and the second clause is in the passive voice: Pickthall thinks that this refers to the horses, and he also renders the word '*ḥijāb*' as 'curtain'. This literal translation may present target readers with an ambiguous interpretation. On the other hand, Ali renders the two metonymies informatively (as in the books of exegesis mentioned above), taking into consideration the contextual meaning, and his free translation is effective because he uses the two paraphrases 'the sun' and 'of night'. Al-Tha'alibi, in his

book *Philology and Secrets of the Arabic Language* (2000, 357), asserts that Arabic Quranic discourse sometimes contains metonymies that have not been mentioned previously, and he refers to the verse ('until [it] was hidden behind the *ḥijāb*') to mean the sun. Thus, metonymy can give rise to difficulties as translators frequently do not contextualise the implicit meaning and instead use a literal translation method, which can lead to ambiguity and confusion.

b) Metaphor

Metaphor differs to metonymy in that the former is used to describe a person or an object by referring to something with similar characteristics (it subsitutes one word for another), while the latter acts by combining ideas: it uses a single characteristic of something for the indentification of a complex entity. According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), metaphor is viewed as another, whereas metonymy stands for another. Translators can therefore find the use of metaphor in the Quran as problematic as metonymy as it includes figurative language which the translator needs to be aware of otherwise he or she may deform its meaning. This is the case in the following example taken from Surah 17: 29:

> *wa-lā tajʿal yadaka maghlūlatan ʾilā ʿunuqika wa-lā tabsuṭhā kulla l-basṭi fa-taqʿuda malūman maḥsūra*
>
> And let not thy hand be chained to thy neck nor open it with a complete opening, lest thou sit down rebuked, denuded. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)
>
> And let not your hand be tied (like a miser) to your neck, nor stretch it forth to its utmost reach (like a spendthrift), so that you become blameworthy and in severe poverty. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> Make not thy hand tied (like a niggard's) to thy neck, nor stretch it forth to its utmost reach, so that thou become blameworthy and destitute. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Al-Razi (1995, 10: 197), Ibn Khathir (1997, 3: 36), Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 66) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13: 67-68) comment that the phrase 'do not tighten your hand about your neck' is a metaphor meaning 'to not be miserly' or 'to not be tight-fisted'. This verse advises Muslims to be neither miserly nor extravagant. Therefore, Pickthall may not have succeeded when using literal translation as his version may confuse readers, failing to convey any coherent meaning. In contrast, the free translation used by Ali and Al-Hilali and Khan may be more

suitable in this instance for decoding the meaning of the source language and transferring it into the target language as they refer to the implicit meaning using parentheses.

Another example of metaphor in the Quran appears in Surah 47: 4:

hattā taḍaʿa l-ḥarbu ʾawzārahā

Until the war lays down its burdens (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Until the war lays down its burden (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Till the war lay down its burden (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

This phrase means 'until the war ends' and in this case Al-Hilali and Khan, Ali and Pickthall have all rendered this metaphor literally, making it hard for the target audience to intuit exactly what is meant.

Abobaker Ali et al. (2012) examine some of the semantic problems that can be encountered when translating the Quran, focusing on metaphors, and they recommend using communicative translation or paraphrasing to convey the intended meaning of metaphors. They illustrate their point with a relevant example from Arberry's translation of Surah 12: 9:

uqtulū yūsufa ʾawi ṭraḥūhu ʾarḍan yakhlu lakum wajhu ʾabīkum

Kill you Joseph, or cast him forth into some land, that your father's face may be free for you. (Arberry, 1982)

The authors note that Arberry translated the metaphorical expression within the verse literally, meaning that target readers would fail to grasp the meaning conveyed in the original Arabic – that the prophet Jacob will pay more attention to and lavish more care on his remaining sons once Joseph, his favourite, has been killed or cast out. This example provides yet more evidence that translators must be alert to metaphors that could pose potential problems when attempting to render the Quran into English.

A further issue that can arise in the act of translating the Quran is the (explicit or implicit) ideology of the translator and its consequent effect on the translation. The following section sheds light on this issue.

3.7 The ideology of the translator and its effect on Quranic translation

The translation of the meaning of the Quran has always been fraught with problems because translators can be biased in their understanding of the sacred text, leading them to select lexical and semantic equivalents that suit their own ideological interpretations. As André Lefevere (2003, 14) maintains, translations are not produced in a vacuum: 'Translators function in a given culture at a given time. The way they understand themselves and their culture is one of the factors that may influence the way in which they translate.' Thus, translators often use vocabulary or forms of interpretation during the translation process that reflect their own doctrines and beliefs; however, as Lefevere implies, this is often unavoidable, particularly when they are unaware of their ideological bias. Hatim and Mason (2005) assert that the translator should be considered as a 'processor' rather than simply a 'translator' of texts in that he or she refines the source text through the prism of their own ideology, and inserts their own understanding and beliefs into the text as it appears in the target language. This may also happen consciously. Nida (1964) notes that the translator sometimes deliberately attempts to alter a message to make it comply with his or her own social, political or religious preferences, and Peter Fawcett and Jeremy Munday (2009) reminds us that, over the centuries, translators and organisations have adapted texts in ways that confirm their own specific beliefs.

This raises the question of the extent to which a translator's ideology influences translation when rendering a sacred source text into a target text. Mollanzar and Mohaqeq (2005, cited in Ahmed Elimam, 2009, 38) analyse how the religious ideology of three Quranic translators affects their translation of the Quran: Shakir is a Shi'a Muslim, Al-Hilali and Khan are Sunni, and Arberry is Christian. Mollanzar and Mohaqeq argue that there is evidence that the religious ideologies of these translators affect their translations in various ways, and they illustrate this claim with the following verse from Surah (8: 41):

> *waʿlamū ʾannamā ghanimtum min shayʾin fa-ʾanna li-llāhi khumusahu wa-li-r-rasūli wa-li-dhī l-qurbā*
>
> And know that whatever of war-booty that you may gain, verily one-fifth of it is assigned to Allah, and to the messenger, and the near relatives. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> And know that whatever thing you gain, a fifth of it is for Allah and for the apostle, and for the near kin. (Shakir, 1993)

Know that, whatever booty you take, the fifth of it is God's and the messenger's, and the near kinsman's. (Arberry, 1995)

According to Elimam (2009), Mollanzar and Mohaqeq (2005) claim that Al-Hilali and Khan's translation implies that the 'one-fifth' mentioned is limited to war booty, while Shakir broadens this to apply to all types of earnings including booty, and Arberry renders the phrase literally, leaving the meaning unclear. In fact, the way that Arberry translates '*ghanimtum*' as 'booty' implies items taken by force, specifically in war, so it cannot be regarded as a literal translation. The word '*ghanimtum*' in this context has a positive connotative meaning: it indicates that, according to Islamic tradition, Muslim soldiers are allowed to collect the valuable properties of their enemy following a successful war, regarding them as a gift from Allah. However, in English, the word 'booty' may denote stealing valuable items from the enemy. Thus, the translations by Shakir, Arberry, and Al-Hilali and Khan are incomplete as they should have used a footnote to clarify the connotative meaning of '*ghanimtum*' in Islamic culture. Mollanzer and Mohaqeq, and Elimam could have referred in their discussions to the name of the surah – 'Al-Anfal' – for clarification. Mujahid, Ikrimah, Ibn Qatadah and Ad-Dahhak (cited in Ibn Khathir, 1997, 2: 246-47) state that the term *'al-anfāl'* means 'the spoils of the war', as do Al-Qurtubi (2006, 9: 441-42), Al-Tabari (1997, 4: 31-32) and Al-Razi (1995, 8: 118).

Habibeh Khosravi and Majid Pourmohammadi (2016) adopt a descriptive, comparative approach in their analysis of the impact of the religious ideology of the translator on a selection of Quranic verses. In their study, they use as examples four verses relating to polygamy, the wearing of the *ḥijāb*, and temporary marriage: Surah An-Nūr (The Light), verse 31; Surah Al-Aḥzāb (The Confederates), verse 59; and Surah An-Nisāʾ (The Women), verses 3 and 24. The translators selected represent different religious backgrounds and ideologies. Saffarzadeh (2005) and Al-Hilali and Khan (1974: 1996) are Muslim, Arberry (1996) is Christian, and Dawood (1990) is an Iraqi Jew. Khosravi and Mohammadi (2016) applied Farahzad's model (2012) – based on Fairclough's (1995) approach – to an analysis of the choices made by these translators by using critical discourse analysis to reveal the ideological implications of their translations.

The authors compared the source test with the target text at two levels: at the textual level, they made an analytical comparison of the lexical choices and translation strategies, while at the paratextual level, their analysis of the metatext (i.e. the target text) was limited to

the translators' footnotes. Thus, in the case of polygamy, they compared the translations of Surah (4: 3):

> *fa-nkiḥū mā ṭāba lakum mina n-nisāʾi mathnā wa-thulātha wa-rubāʿ*
>
> And if [as a guardian] you fear that you may not be able to deal with orphan (girls) justly, then you marry other women of your choice, two or three or four. (Saffarzadeh, 2005)
>
> And if you fear that you shall not be able to deal justly with the orphan-girls then marry (other) women of your choice**,** two or three, or four. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> If you fear that you will not act justly toward the orphans, marry such women as seem good to you, two, three, four. (Arberry, 1996)
>
> If you fear that you cannot treat orphans with fairness, then you may marry other women who seem good to you; two, three, four. (Dawood, 1990)

Khosravi and Mohammadi (2016) explain that the underlined phrase '*mā ṭāba lakum*' implies Allah's permission to take more than one wife. The root of the verb '*ṭāba*' is '*ṭayyb*', which meant suitable, good or clean, and this verse is an extension of the preceding verse that emphasises justice, generosity and good treatment towards female orphans and other women. Khosravi and Mohammadi (2016) claim that Saffarzadeh, and Al-Hilali and Khan render this phrase as 'of your choice', implying male dominance over women, while the translations of both Arberry and Dawood suggest the need for men to adopt a stance of generosity and justice towards women, meaning that the ideological implication of their translation is the same as that of the Quran. The authors conclude that their results demonstrate that it is difficult to determine any precise relationship between a translator's religious beliefs and their translation of the Quran as other factors relating to the socio-cultural norms and dominant political ideology of their country or region, not to mention that of the patron sponsoring the translation, can be equally influential. This can be seen in the fact that the translations of the Quranic phrase '*mā ṭāba lakum*' by Arberry and Dawood appear more informative and appropriate, while the phrase 'of your choice' selected by Saffarzadeh and Al-Hilali implies 'something that seems good to you'.

Elimam (2009) provides useful insights into the issue of translator orientation and ideology, arguing that translator's *tafsīr* (interpretation) during the translation process can indicate his or her religious ideology, as can the translator's preface (if this exists), together with the themes addressed in their footnotes or additional commentary. He illustrates his argument with an example from Sale (1836) who refers to Muslims as 'Mohammedans', implying that Muslims worship Mohammed rather than Allah (Elimam, 2009, 37). Translators, therefore, may render the Quranic text according to their ideological predispositions, and this may happen consciously or unconsciously. They may be affected by various types of ideology, including religious, cultural and social ideologies, and this has the potential to affect the translation and distort the meaning of the original text.

3.8 Approaches to Quranic translation

This section of the study discusses some of the many different approaches to Quranic translation, including those of Ali Quli (2005), Al-ʿUbayd (2002), Al-Fawzan (2002) and Abdel-Haleem (2004). These scholars recommend avoiding literal translation and suggest the use of other approaches instead. For example, Quli advocates a 'phrase-by-phrase' or 'mirror-phrase' method, claiming that when this is applied to translating the Quran it produces an informative message. Al-ʿUbayd and Al-Fawzan, however, claim that the exegetic translation method is more useful in rendering the Quranic text into English, while Abdel-Haleem believes that an intertextual approach – translating the Quran through the Quran – is most effective.

Elimam (2009, 24) points out that 'translators of the Qurān generally attempt to remain as close as possible to the text in order to reflect some features of the Qurānic style in their work'. Abdelwali (2007, 10) announces that 'most Qurān translations into English are source-language oriented. They are marked by dogged adherence to source syntax and the use of archaic language'. Some translators of the Quran, such as Al-Hilali and Khan (1974: 1996) and Ali (1934: 1975), do not mention the approaches they adopt in their translations. For example, the former two authors have not written an introduction to their translation outlining the methods they used, while the latter states that he intends to render the meaning of the Quran into English but fails to mention the approach he employed. On the other hand, Pickthall (1930: 1935, v), mentions that his translation of the Quran is a literal translation: it seems that he intended to preserve the style of the source text. Other scholars have also preferred to adopt a literal translation when rendering the Quranic text into English. For

example, El-Gemei (2000, 4, cited in Al-Salem, 2008, 89) has conducted a study on the power of discourse in religious translation in which she argues the merits of a literal translation of the Quran, asserting that '[i]t should be noted here that for the TL [target language] to bring out the true picture of power in the religious *ayas* [verses], [the text] should be translated literally, [i]n the sense that the dialogue form should be transferred into a dialogue in the TL in the same order of question followed by an answer'.

Quli (2005, xvi-xvii) draws attention to two distinct approaches to Quranic translations: the first is the interlinear translation that was common practice for translations of the Quran published in Persian and Urdu during the last two centuries. He maintains that this approach can assist non-Arabic-speaking readers when reciting the Quran but is not particularly useful in understanding it as it does not provide the full spectrum of meanings the text contains. He observes that word-for-word translation focuses on the meaning of each word in a particular phrase but does not provide the underlying meaning embedded in the verse. Instead, Quli advocates the adoption of a 'phrase-by-phrase' or 'mirror-paraphrasing' approach, arguing that this approach attempts to bring some of the advantages of interlinear translation to English-speaking readers. He further maintains that, with this approach, the translation of the source text develops phrase by phrase and focuses on the semantic translation – in other words, each complete phrase in Arabic needs to be transferred as a corresponding phrase in the target text. Quli argues that this is effective if the translator is highly aware of the Arabic lexical items and their morphology, and states that the aim of this approach is to maintain a formal equivalence between the phrases and clauses of the source and target texts by making some adjustments and changes in the grammar, and using substitutions, additions and omissions to render the phrase explicit, with reference to the interpretations mentioned by commentators. However, Quli (2005: xix) mentions that he does translate some Arabic idioms in the Quran literally because their meanings are relatively easy for an English readership to understand. One example of this is his translation of Surah (32: 16):

tatajāfa junūbuhum ʿani l-maḍājiʿi yadʿūna rabbahum khawfan wa-ṭamaʿan

Their sides vacate their beds to supplicate their lord in fear and hope (Quli, 2005)

This literal translation of the verse, however, does not convey the accurate meaning of the original text of the Quran. According to Al-Qurṭubī (2006, 17: 28-29), the clause '*tatajāfa junwbuhumʿani al-maḍājiʿ*' is a metaphor meaning 'they go to worship, leaving their beds to

perform the night prayer (*qyam al-layl*)' (Ibn Khathir, 1997, 3: 402; Al-Razi, 1995, 13: 180; Al-Tabari, 1997, 6: 156). Al-Razi (1995, 13: 180) states that the word '*yadʿūna*' (literally, to supplicate) in this verse means 'to invoke'. Quli's translation does not convey the intended meaning, which is to perform the night prayer, as he renders the verb literally, with the result that the target reader would probably be unable to understand the implication of the verse. Literal translation seems to be a risky approach to adopt when translating the Quran, particularly when it comes to words that sound strange to Arabic readers. The implications of the clause '*tatajāfa junūbuhum ʿani l-maḍājʿi*' in this verse would be as difficult for Arabic native speakers to grasp as it is for non-Arabic speakers, unless they happen to be a specialist in Islamic terms or are able to consult the Quranic exegeses.

Quli's phrase-by-phrase or mirror-paraphrasing approach, therefore, does not seem to narrow the cultural and linguistic gaps between the Arabic language of the Quran and the English language. For example, some of the information included in the historical background is not mentioned in his footnotes, such as the parable of Dhul-Qarnayn and of Gog and Mogag in Surah 18: 94. Quli has also omitted historical information concerning 'the men of the ditch' in his translation of Surah Al-Buruj (85: 4). Besides, he uses neither paraphrases nor footnotes to clarify certain Islamic cultural concepts such as '*zakāh*'or '*aṣ-ṣalāt*' or (fasting). It appears that Quli adheres to literal translation in some verses where this approach should not have been used: for example, in Surah 2: 10, he translates the phrase *'fī qulūbihim maraḍun fa-zādahumu llāhu maraḍan*' as 'There is a sickness in their hearts; then Allah increased their sickness' (Quli, 2005). The word '*maraḍun*' (literally, disease) is a spiritual sickness that in this verse implies that someone who pretends to be a believer is hypocritical as they harbour doubt in their heart toward the Prophet Mohammed and Islam, as noted in the commentaries of Ibn Khathir (1997, 1: 60), Al-Tabari (1997, 1: 120) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 1: 299-300). Al-Tabari reports that Ibn Faris states that the word 'disease' also includes the sense of hypocrisy or indifference when performing an act, while Al-Qurtubi comments that the word 'disease' in this verse is a metaphor meaning that someone's belief has been corrupted. According to DAEQU (2008, 772), '*fī qulūbihim maraḍun*' means those who are corrupt at heart (literally, 'those in whose hearts is sickness').

Al-ʿUbayd (2002) observes that there are three methods that can be adopted when translating the Quran: (1) literal translation, which renders each word into an equivalent one in the target language and maintains the word order of the source language; (2) lexical translation, which implies substituting items in the source language with items in the target

language without attempting to replicate the word order; and (3) exegetical translation, which can be applied in one of the two following ways. The first is to translate exegetically and directly from the Quran. In order to accomplish this, the translator has to have a high degree of knowledge of both Quranic interpretations and the different translation approaches. The second option is to translate the Arabic exegetic materials of the Quran (*tafsīr*), and in this case, they need to be highly knowledgeable about the translation process. Al-ʿUbayd (2002) elaborates further, stating that when translators use the three methods he cites they often depart from the rules during the translation process. He observes that the lexical translation method is close to that of literal translation, and that neither should be applied in rendering the Quran into another language as there is no lexical equivalent to the original text of the Quran, and the message will, therefore, become distorted and significant features of the Quran will be lost. However, he believes that it is possible to apply the exegetical translation method because it is, in effect, a translation of an interpretation of the Quran not of the Quran itself, and it has advantages in that it can convey and clarify the meaning of the Quran to both non-Muslims and Muslims who do not speak Arabic.

Like Al-ʿUbayd, Al-Fawzan (2002) maintains that word-for-word or literal translation should not be used when rendering the Quran into another language since this approach is only useful when the source and target languages are close in terms of lexis and syntax – which is not the case for Arabic and English. He strongly criticises the use of this approach in translating the Quran as he believes it risks distorting the ambiguous meanings of the sacred text. To avoid this danger, he advises translating and interpreting the Arabic *tafsīr* into other languages rather than translating the Quran itself. He notes that Quranic scholars unanimously agree on the need to use the exegetical translation method as this can be used to elucidate the underlying meanings of the Quran, but he further believes that translating and interpreting Arabic *tafsīr* in English or any other language should take priority over translating the meaning of the Quran. Al-Fawzan concludes that the exegetic translation method can be applied even to the translation of the meaning of the Quran.

Abdel-Haleem (2004) also rejects literal translation, maintaining that some words in the Quran assume different meanings in different contexts (‘*wujūh al-Quran*’). Therefore, using a single meaning of a word in a translation may lead to misinterpretation unless paraphrasing, footnotes and endnotes are used to clarify the different meanings and elucidate the ambiguity of the source language, with reference to its cultural background. Abdel-Haleem attempts to provide solutions to this problem, emphasising that a useful approach to

adopt when rendering the Quran into another language is an intertextual technique, which is based on the idea that one element of the Quran can be used to explain another, and he advocates elucidating the meaning of ambiguous passages in footnotes. He (2004, xxx) refers to Ibn Taimiya (d. 1328 CE), who argued that 'what is stated in a general way in one place is explained in detail in another; what is stated briefly in one place is explained at length in another'. According to Abdel-Haleem, this exegete considered intertextual reading as the most appropriate method for interpreting the Quran, and many scholars, including Ibn Khathir and Al-Tabari, have adopted this approach, using the Quran to interpret the Quran. Abdel-Haleem elaborates further on the other technique that identifying contextual meaning is pivotal to interpreting the meaning of Quranic discourse as the sacred text includes culturally specific collocations with contextual meanings and connotations that translators need to be aware of.

In summary, Quli's (phrase by phrase) approach seems not to be successful within some verses that include metaphorical meanings as it focuses on a literal translation that distorts the message and leads target readers into confusion as seen above. Therefore, this section has also discussed some useful approaches to translation of the Quran, such as the exegetical translation method suggested by Al-ʿUbayd (2002) and Al-Fawzan (2002). This can be used to translate the meaning of the Quran. Abdel-Haleem (2004) also focuses on effective techniques such as the use of intertextuality to recognise the contextual meaning embedded in the verses. These authors' advice is to avoid adopting a literal translation method which, in many cases, will deform the meaning of the Quran, as the text is imbued with deeper meanings that lie hidden within its structures, and as such, its style is unique. A free translation method is a more suitable approach that focuses on the content of the source text which means the same content is expressed in the target text, but with very different grammatical structures. Therefore, this approach aims to translate the spirit and message freely without constraints and uses different strategies such as shifting, paraphrase, explanatory note, footnote, and makes the message accessable to the readership. According to Munday (2001, 20), sense-for-sense translation permits 'the sense or content of the SL (source language) to be translated'.

3.9 The role of *tafsir* (interpretation) in translating the Quran

According to von Denffer (1994, 95), '[t]he word *tafsīr* is derived from the root "*fassara*" – to explain, to expound. It means "explanation" or "interpretation"'. Abdul-Raof (2001)

believes that this concept (exegesis) exists in the Quran itself. He gives the following example:

> *wa-lā yaʾtūnaka bi-mathalin ʾillā jiʾnāka bi-l-ḥaqqi wa-ʾaḥsana tafsīra* (25: 33)
> They cannot put any argument to you without our bringing you the truth and the best explanation. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004)

Allah asked the Prophet Mohammed to recite and explain the teachings of the Quran to his people and for this reason he is considered to be its first interpreter; after his death, his companions took on this task so that the meaning of the Quran could be preserved for future generations of Muslims. According to Islamic tradition, Mohammed's companions used to learn ten verses from the Prophet and then study their meaning. Later on, Muslim scholars assumed the task of interpretation.

Al-Suyuti (2004) stresses the necessity of using *tafsīr* to explain meaning in the Quran, listing three main reasons for this. Firstly, the Quran uses the most eloquent language which can only be understood by those who master Arabic; those who lack sufficient proficiency in Arabic need to have recourse to *tafsīr*. Secondly, when the Quran refers to events, it sometimes does not give the background to every particular verse, meaning that *tafsīr* is needed for a full understanding. Thirdly, some words have different meanings and a *tafsīr* specialist is required to clarify these meanings. These reasons highlight the need for translators to not only master both source and target languages, but also to be knowledgeable about the science of *tafsīr* in order to transfer the meaning of the Quran accurately to their target readers. Beekman and Callow (1974, 35) state that 'exegesis thus lies at the heart of all translation works for if the translator does not know what the original means, then it is impossible for him to translate faithfully'.

Al-Qurtubi (1992, cited in Abdul-Raof, 2001) identifies three eminent schools of exegesis: the School of Mecca led by Abdullah Ibn Abbas, the School of Medina led by Ubay bin Ka'b, and the School of Iraq led by Abdullah Ibn Mas'ud. Philips (2005, 26-28) stresses that Ibn Abbas was the greatest *tafsīr* scholar among the *ṣaḥābah* (the companions of the Prophet) and relates how Mohammed prayed for him, saying: 'O Allah, give him a deep understanding of the religion and make him skilled in interpretation.' Nevertheless, it was Ibn Ka'b who was the first scholar to be selected by Muhammed to record the revelations contained in the Quran. Ibn Mas'ud, however, was the sixth person to convert to Islam and also one of the best reciters of the Quran: Philips tells how Mohammed praised Ibn Mas'ud's

recitation:'[W]hoever wishes to recite the Quran in the tender manner in which it was revealed should recite it as Ibn Umm 'Abd (Ibn Mas'ud) does.' According to Ushama (1995), the methodology used by these schools contributed significantly to the development of Quranic exegesis since many *mufassirūn* (interpreters), who were students of the Prophet's companions, produced methodologies and commentaries on the Quran.

Ibn-Taimiya (661-728:2001) identified the most appropriate methods for interpreting the Quran: the first method he mentioned was interpreting the Quran through the Quran – if the verse is brief it can be used to interpret a similar verse in another position; the second was through the narrations of the Prophet Mohammed himself; the third was through the narrations of the Prophet's companions, since they possessed the most knowledge concerning the sacred text and had witnessed the revelation of the Quran; and the fourth was through the narrations of his followers (*tābiʿūn*) who lived in the period following Mohammed's death. Ibn-Taīmīya asserted, however, that the last method should only be used if all the other methods were unavailable.

In the context of the present day, Abdul-Raof (2001) identifies six main categories of exegesis: (1) linguistic exegesis is concerned with the analysis of the grammar, syntax and rhetoric of Quranic discourse; (2) philosophical and rationalistic exegesis focuses on clarifying or rebutting philosophers' views and arguments on the Quran; (3) intertextual exegesis interprets the Quran using the Quran or the hadiths; (4) historical exegesis concentrates on the parables and the history of the nations and peoples mentioned in the Quran; (5) jurisprudence exegesis is principally interested in explaining legal matters and the different views among Muslim theologians; and lastly, (6) independent judgement exegesis relies on the personal judgement of the exegete. In the final case, exegetes usually take into consideration the context and linguistic structures as well as the referential meanings of Quranic words.

Von Denffer (1994, 96-97) also asserts that Muslim scholars have laid down certain conditions for a sound *tafsīr* and interpreters (*mufassirūn*) must meet the following conditions: they must be of sound belief (*ʿaqīdah*); they should be well-grounded in knowledge of Arabic and its linguistic rules, as well as in other sciences related to the study of the Quran – for instance, the science of narration (*ʿilm ar-riwāyāt*); and they should be able to comprehend the meaning of the text very precisely and refrain from the use of mere opinion. He considers that it is extremely important for the interpreter to begin the *tafsīr* of the Quran using the

Quran itself. The interpreter should also attempt to find guidance from the words and explanations provided by the Prophet and should mention the reports of the *saḥābah* or Mohammed's companions as well as those of the *tābiʿūn* (followers of Mohammed). Finally, the interpreter should take into account the opinions of other prominent scholars.

As mentioned in the first chapter see (1.1.3), the present study uses four exegetical books for its comparative analysis of the way three selected translations render the collocations found in the Quranic text into English. The exegeses of Ibn Khathir (1997), Al-Tabari (1997) and Al-Qurtubi (2006) can be classified as intertextual, historical and jurisprudence exegeses, respectively. However, all three use very similar methods when interpreting the Quran. Al-Razi (1995), on the other hand, was more of a linguistic exegete, as he seems to be more expert in identifying and explaining the words in terms of the Arabic language and its grammatical constructions rather than their theological meaning. He also appears to tend towards a philosophical exegesis in some of his explanations.

Younus Mirza (2014) believes that Ibn Kathir took the best approach, which is to interpret the Quran through the Quran, particularly as he was interested in reliable historical narratives. Mizra observes that Ibn Kathir prioritised the hadīths of Mohammed over those of his companions and followers or the use of other interpretive tools such as referring to other exegetes. Mizra, however, confirms that some Western scholars such as Clander (1993) criticise Ibn Kathir's interpretation because of its use of lists of hadīths, accompanied by minimal commentary, as well as the fact that he does not engage with linguistic forms. However, Mizra emphasises that Ibn Kathir contributed significantly to the exegetical tradition in that he collected the authoritative hadiths and merged them with *tafsīr*. Mizra asserts that although previous exegetes had inserted the narrations of the Prophet Mohammed into their commentaries, none had done so at the same level as Ibn Kathir. This may be attributed to the fact that Ibn Kathir was a highly influential Sunni scholar and his Quranic exegesis relies on narrations of the hadīths of the Prophet, his companions and followers. Indeed, the *Tafsīr of Ibn Kathir* remains one of the earliest and most widely read commentaries on the Quran.

According to Abdulkadir Sambo (2015), Al-Tabari was an expert and a prominent scholar in certain fields of study: the Quranic sciences, the hadīths, history and jurisprudence. Sambo comments that by naming his book the *Jamiʿal-bayan fī taʾwīl āy al-Quran*, Al-Tabari indicated that he intended to deal mainly with the hidden meanings of the Quran, and one of

his most significant methods was to adhere strictly to the *ʾisnād* (chain of authority), which mainly depends on the reports of the companions and followers of Mohammed. When opinions are dissimilar, Al-Tabari offers his assessment of the different views, followed by his personal opinion. Sambo adds that Al-Tabari does not ignore the consensus of Muslim scholars (*ʿulamāʾ*), nor does he reject Israelite reports, but he gives priority to the early scholars among the Prophet's companions and encourages the use of Arabic ideas when interpreting the Quran. Von Denffer (1994) believes that the *tafsīr* of Al-Tabari the most detailed work we have on the subject. At the same time, however, he criticises this *tafsīr* as it includes some reports of Israelites that he does not consider sound. A part of Al-Tabari's historical exegesis includes Israelite which reports legendary and religious literature of the Jews and Christains as well as Zoroastrian and other religions.

When it comes to Al-Qurtubi, Abdul-Raof (2001) asserts that his *tafsīr*, *Al-Jāmi' Li'aḥkām Al-Quran*, is an extensive and comprehensive exegesis, focusing on topics of jurisprudence and introducing the different views of legal scholars on these matters. Philips (2005) confirms that Al-Qurtubi inserts narrations of the Prophet as well as explanations from the Prophet Mohammed's companions and followers into his interpretation of each verse. He states that Al-Qurtubi usually starts with an explanation of the vocabulary used in the verse, citing poetry to clarify the difficult words, and in the discussion of particularly obscure matters, he refers to the main scholarly opinions on the subject and their evidence, followed by his own assessment. Clander (1993) cited in Mirza (2014: 6), observes that Al-Qurtubi was a 'speculative exegete' in that he introduced and debated the interpretations of other exegetes.

Yasir Qadhi (1999), meanwhile, relates that the *tafsīr* of Al-Razi includes a detailed discussion of the relationship between the verses and surahs in the Quran, focusing on a grammatical analysis of and commentary on the Quran. Ceylan (1980) confirms that Al-Razi also adopted a philosophical approach in his interpretation of the Quran, his main source being Ibn Sina, but adds that he disagreed with Ibn Sina on certain major issues regarding existence, epistemology and the creation of the world. Qadhi (1999), in fact, states that a shortcoming of Al-Razi's *tafsīr* is that includes too many philosophical discussions. Ceylan (1980) also criticises Al-Razi, claiming that he was influenced by and mainly relied on Al-Zamakshari's *tafsīr* (*al-kashshāf*) for the linguistic explanation of the verses. However, it can be argued that this in itself does not indicate a lack of originality. Yasin Ceylan reports that Ibn-Taimiyah comments on the *tafsir* of Al-Razi, saying that includes all things except

exegesis. Ibn-Taimiya's criticism could mean that Al-Razi does not, for the most part, reference the narrations of the Prophet Mohammed and his companions when interpreting the verses in the Quran; however, Ceylan (1980) also refers to Subkhi (1906) who asserts that, to the contrary, Al-Razi's interpretation contains all things including exegesis.

These four *tafsīr* were chosen to support the comparative analysis in this research because their structure and manner of explication facilitate an understanding of the underlying meaning of the Quranic verses. Ibn Khathir, Al-Qurtubi and Al-Tabari do not engage in an analysis of the grammar and syntax of the Quran but, rather, analyse its rhetoric. Al-Razi also analyses the linguistic forms of the vocabulary used in the Quran, and occasionally has recourse to theological arguments to lend authority to his interpretation. These four *tafsīr* represent a vital tool for translators because they help clarify the implicit meaning of the Quranic verses and provide a semantic analysis of the text. In addition, they indicate the reasons for the revelations contained in the verses in a way that allows the translator to understand their situational and cultural meaning. What is more, these *tafsīr* support their argument effectively by looking to the historical chain of Islamic authority, including the narrations of the Prophet Mohammed himself, and those of his companions and followers.

The following example from Surah 25: 53 illustrates how the approaches of the exegeses described above help clarify the meaning of the Quranic verse that reads:

> *wa-huwa lladhī maraja l-baḥrayni hādhā ʿadhbun furātun wa-hādhā milḥun ʾujājun wa-jaʿala baynahumā barzakhan wa-ḥijran maḥjūra*
>
> And it is he who has let free the two seas, this is palatable and sweet, and that is salty and bitter, and has set a barrier and complete partition between them. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Ibn Kathir (1997, 13: 285) states that Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Jarir claim that Allah created two kinds of 'seas' or bodies of water: sweet (or fresh) water and salt water. The former are rivers, springs and wells; the latter are the seas, including the Atlantic Ocean, the Red Sea and the Black Sea, whose water is salty, bitter and undrinkable. Ibn Kathir elaborates further, saying that Allah created the salt in these seas to preserve the air and the environment, as well as the earth, from contamination. Since the seas contain salt, the air is fresh, and the fish and creatures in the sea are tasty to eat. Ibn Kathir refers to the Prophet Mohammed's answer

when asked if it is possible of to practice *wuḍūʾ* (ablution) in the sea. He replied that 'its water is pure and it is permissible [*ḥalal*] to eat its dead meat'. Ibn Kathir explains that Allah has set a barrier between fresh ('sweet') water and the salt water of the sea. He identifies two similar verses in the Quran, using intertextual exegesis: Surahs (55: 19-20) and (27: 61).

> *maraja l-baḥrayni yaltaqiyān baynahumā barzakhun lā yabghiyān*
>
> He has let loose the two seas (the salt water and the sweet) meeting together, between them is a barrier which none of them can transgress. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> *ʾam-man jaʿala l-ʾarḍa qarāran wa-jaʿala khilālahā ʾanhāran wa-jaʿala lahā rawāsiya wa-jaʿala bayna l-baḥrayni ḥājizan ʾa-ʾilāhun maʿa llāhi bal ʾaktharuhum lā yaʿlamūn*
>
> Who is it that made the earth a stable place to live? Who made rivers flow through it? Who set immovable mountains on it and created a barrier between the fresh and salt water? Is it another god beside God? No! But most of them do not know. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004)

Al-Qurtubi (2006, 15: 450-51) explains the meaning of the Quranic reference to the 'two seas' in the same way as Ibn Kathir, referring to the Surah (55: 19-20) but also to the narrations of the *ṣaḥabah* and followers of the Prophet. Al-Qurtubi also looks to the narration of the Prophet Mohammed concerning the meaning (*maraj*) of the verse referred to above, while Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 6161) points to the narration of the *ṣaḥābah* on the subject. However, Al-Razi (1995, 12: 101-102) explains the verse more comprehensively, presenting its meaning in detail, as well as clarifying the difference between salt water and fresh water. He relies primarly on the Arabic language in his explanation of the verses, and he sometimes appears a pholosphor. Nur Baharuddin et al. (2018) assert that Al-Razi'works are very much relevant and sufficiently great even in the modern times. Ibn Kathir, Al-Ṭabari, and Al-Qurtubi, on the other hand, seem to focus significantly on theological meanings of the words in the Quran.

3.10 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a general background to the subject of translating the Quran, covering its distinctive characteristics as a text and focusing on the Islamic tradition of Quranic inimitability. It has also discussed the cultural and linguistic problems translators encounter in translating the Quran, and explored some of the approaches that can be applied

when rendering the Quran into English in order to bridge the cultural and linguistic gaps that exist between the source language and the target language. The chapter has also advanced the argument that adopting the method of literal translation may obscure and even distort the meaning of some of the cultural elements in the Quran, leading to confusion among the target readers. For this reason, the free translation method offers a more suitable approach when rendering the Quranic text into English as this method can be used to clarify the meaning of the Arabic text for a non-Arabic-speaking readership. This kind of translation has additional extraneous information which is not included in the source text and the translator will be able to use different techniques with this approach to transfer these information appropriately such as paraphrase, footnote, addition, explanatory note, shifting, and descriptive and functional equivalence. In addition, the chapter has highlighted the crucial role played by the work of exegetes in interpreting the meaning of the Quran and has explained the methods they employed. Therefore, the current thesis presents an investigation into the problems of rendering the Arabic collocational phrases in the Quran into English. The research reveals that literal translation may sometimes distort the meaning of the collocations found in the source text, while free translation is able to convey a better sense of their implicit meaning. The thesis studies three translations of the Quran – those of Muhammad Pickthall (1930), Abdullah Ali (1934) and Al-Hilali and Khan (1974) – and undertakes an in-depth comparison of their translations of a selection of collocations. It discovers the advantages and disadvantages of the methods employed by the translators with the aid of the Quranic exegeses of Al-Tabari (839-923 CE), Al-Razi (544-604 CE), Al-Qurtubi (1214-1273 CE), and Ibn Kathir (1300-1373), and relevant works by prominent Muslim theologians such as Al-Damaghany (1007-1085: 1983) and Ibn Al-Jawzy (510-597: 1987), as well as a number of established Arabic-English dictionaries, such as the *Arabic-English Dictionary of Quranic Usage* (DAEQU) (Abdel-Haleem and Al-Badwi,2008), the *Dictionary of the Contemporary Arabic Language* (DCAL) (Omar,2008) ,and the *Lisān Al-Arab* (DLA) (Ibn Manzur,1955).

Chapter Four
Collocations in Arabic And English

4.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by describing the concept of collocation as a linguistic phenomenon and focuses on the meaning of collocations, and their restrictions and clashes. It examines the debates among theorists concerning their use in Arabic, with some arguing that the meaning of a collocation is determined by semantic relations and others contending it is determined by grammar. This is followed by a review of the general linguistic theory of collocations in English and the varied responses to John Firth's theory of meaning (1957), and touches upon typologies of collocations in both Arabic and English. In the Arabic language, there is a great number of different ways in which words can combine with each other, and the chapter provides a comparison between Arabic and English collocations, followed by a typology of the collocations found in the Quran, with particular reference to culturally specific collocations.

4.2 Collocation as a linguistic phenomenon

Collocation was first studied as a linguistic phenomenon as early as 2,300 years ago by the Greek Stoic philosophers (Robins, 1967, 21, cited in Christina Gitsaki, 1999, 10). By the eighteenth century, scholars were using descriptive linguistics to investigate the subject. However, according to Ronald Carter and Michael McCarthy (1988, 32), Firth (1935: 1957) was the first scholar to actually use the term 'collocation' in lexical studies.

Jens Bahns (1993, 57) notes that '[r]egrettably, collocation is a term which is used and understood in many different ways', while Zinab Ahmed (2012, 12) argues that although researchers have given a number of different names to collocations, they are basically studying the same phenomenon. Collocations have been variously referred to as 'word combinations' (Akhmanova, 1974, cited in Cowie, 1998), 'phrasal lexemes' (Lipka, 1999) and 'phraseological units' (Ginzburg et al. 1979 cited in Cowie, 1998). Ahmed (2012:14) also notes that Nesselhauf (2005, ii) stresses that 'the only consensus among researchers is that the term refers to 'some kind of syntagmatic relations'. Dalal El-Gemei (2006) and Bahumaid (2006) define collocation as a linguistic phenomenon found in all languages in which two words can combine together to form a specific meaning.

Linguistically speaking, a collocation is a lexical relationship between two or more words in a language. It appears to be related to the arbitrary co-occurrence of words rather than rule-based combinations. The meaning of collocations is context-dependent and sometimes a lexical item can change its meaning on the basis of the other lexical item with which it is combined. Nida (1964, 98) demonstrates this point with an illustration of the use of the word 'chair' in different contexts:

[He] has accepted a university chair
The electric chair
[She] will chair the meeting

In the first example, 'chair' refers to an academic position; in the second, it means a device for execution; while in the third, the verb 'to chair' means 'to preside over'. These three examples show that a lexical item obtains its meaning from its collocate. The current study adopts Baker's (1992, 14) definition of collocations as 'semantically arbitrary restrictions' (see Chapter One), and relates this to the translation of metaphorical and culturally specific collocations in the text of the Quran, which can be difficult to grasp. As such, the collocates in the Quran frequently include different meanings, depending on the context and the other collocates with which they are combined. For example, the word '*khayr*' (good) entails four different meanings, depending on its context. For example, the Quranic collocation (50: 25), '*mannāʿin li-l-khayri'* (noun + preposition + noun), includes the meaning of the word '*lilkhayr*' as 'someone who hinders something': here, the collocation could be taken to mean 'a hinderer of *khayr* [Islam]' (my translation). In Surah 2: 180, however, it refers to money, as in the phrase '*in taraka khayran*' – 'if he leaves *khayran* [wealth]' (my translation) – while in Surah 22: 36, the word '*khayr*' implies reward: '*lakum fīhā Khayrun*' or 'therein you have good rewards' (my translation).

The following sections of this chapter will, therefore, address linguistic theory of English and Arabic collocations, collocational meanings, restrictions and clashes, culturally-specific collocations in the Quran and the issues these subjects raise.

4.3 Linguistic theory of English collocations

Collocations are a controversial phenomenon, due to the fact that they are not easily defined linguistically. Michael Halliday (1966), John Sinclair (1966), Alan Cruse (1986) and Terence Mitchell (1971) have studied collocations from semantic, lexical and grammatical

perspectives. Many such linguists and semanticists have been influenced in one way or another by Firth's (1957) collocational theory of meaning (mentioned above), with some agreeing with his theoretical understanding, others opposing it. For example, some linguists and semanticists criticise Firth, contending that he does not provide sufficient support for his argument as he is unable to explain why only certain lexical items can collocate with each other.

Firth (1957, 196) defines collocation as 'an abstraction at the syntagmatic level […] not directly related to the conceptual approach of the meaning of words'. He argues that the relationship of meaning within lexical items of collocation is a syntagmatic not a paradigmatic one. John Lyons (1977, 240, 241), in his discussion of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations, states that 'the syntagmatic relations which a unit contracts are those which it contracts by virtue of its combination (in a syntagmatic construction) with other units of the same level'. He provides an example, explaining that in the phrase 'the old man', the lexeme 'old' is syntagmatically associated with the definite article 'the', as well as the noun 'man'. However, '[the paradigmatic relations] contracted by units are those which hold between a particular unit in a given syntagm and other units which are substitutable for it in the syntagm'. Thus, in the same phrase, the word 'old' is paradigmatically associated with the descriptions of 'young' and 'tall', adjectives that could be used to replace it. For Firth (1957, 11), therefore, collocation is 'the company that words keep or actual words in habitual company'. He tends to concentrate on this level of meaning.

According to Geoffrey Leech (1974) and Geoff Barnbrook et al. (2013), Firth elucidates not only the vital role played by collocation in the meaning of words but also shows the nature of its relation to linguistic theory, confirming that collocative meaning refers to the relationship of a word with certain other words with which it is regularly collocated. Leech (1974, 17) illustrates this point by noting that 'pretty' and 'handsome' share the same meaning of 'good looking' but each has a range of nouns with which they regularly collocate. Therefore, 'handsome' typically collocates with the nouns 'boy', 'man' or 'car', while 'pretty' collocates with the nouns 'girl', 'woman' or 'flower'.

However, both John Lyons (1966), and Adrienne Lehrer (1974) raise objections to Firth's theory of meaning. Lyons (1966, 289-97) strongly criticises Firth on the grounds that the application of his contextual theory of meaning does not provide us with a complete theory of semantics since his analysis of patterns of co-occurrence of real words does not take

into consideration semantic compatibility. Lyons further contends that Firth fails to fully elucidate the concept of collocation or explain his examples in sufficient depth; however, he does later acknowledge that 'there is frequently so high a degree of interdependence between lexemes which tend to occur in texts in collocation with one another that their potentiality for collocation is reasonably described as being part of their meaning' (1977, 613). Arguing as a semanticist, Lehrer (1974) similarly criticises Firth for his lack of precision when defining or explaining collocational meanings. She further notes that many of the studies exploring how words associate together in a lexical set fail to account for the fact that certain lexical items appear less often than expected.

A number of neo-Firthian linguists, including Halliday (1966) and Sinclair (1966), have developed Firth's theory, emphasising the important role played by collocations in language. Ahmed (2012, 17) highlights Halliday's (1966, 150-51) view that collocation cuts across grammatical categories, citing his example that, in the phrase 'he argued strongly, the strength of his argument', the collocation between 'strong' and 'argument' persists despite the grammatical change. Halliday advocates the lexico-grammatical system described in his own work and considers collocation as one of the main components in this system (see Table 4.1, below).

	Grammar	**Lexis**
Paradigmatic axis	system	set
Syntagmatic axis	structure	collocation

Table 4.1: Halliday's lexico-grammatical system

According to Ahmed (2012, 18), Halliday (1966, 150) asserts that collocational relations are split along structural lines, noting that grammar does not always elucidate the relationships between adjectives such as 'strong' and 'powerful'. These adjectives form part of a set of items and are not always able to collocate with the same words. Thus, 'strong car' and 'powerful tea' would both be classed as ungrammatical (unlexical), whereas 'powerful car' and 'strong tea' would be grammatical. Therefore, although these two adjectives depend on

the syntagmatic relations into which each enters, the collocational patterning is independent of the grammatical structure. Halliday (1966, 153) defines collocation as 'a linear co-occurrence relationship among lexical items which co-occur together', but he also considers the concept of a 'set' to be an additional element in the collocability of words, referring to this as 'the grouping of members with like privilege of occurrence in collocation'. He illustrates this idea with the example that words such as 'bright', 'hot', 'light' and 'shine' all belong to the same lexical set due to the fact that they collocate with the word 'sun' (1966, 158). According to Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976, 286), there is a systematic relation between a pair of words, and therefore any two lexical items including similar collocational patterns that occur in similar contexts will create a cohesive force if they appear in adjoined sentences. This effect is not only based on a pair of words, as it is common for long cohesive chains to produce lexical relations of patterns such as 'candle/flame/flicker', 'hair/comb/curl', 'reader/writer/style' or 'sky/sunshine/cloud'.

Like Halliday, Sinclair (1966, 411) views grammar and lexis as 'two different interpenetrating aspects'. He posits that language structure within grammar is arranged by a system of choices, such as the choice between using the active or the passive voice, while in a system of collocation, lexical items tend to collocate with one another, adding that these tendencies 'ought to tell us facts about language that cannot be got by grammatical analysis'. He focuses on the notion of the tendencies of lexical items, proposing an analytical framework that combines both lexis and grammar. Sinclair (1966: 415) uses the term 'node' to refer to an item, calling the number of lexical items within each node a 'span', which in turn consists of 'collocates'. Thus, if the noun 'accident' is the node, and if we decide to have a span of four, then the four lexical items before and after this word are regarded as its collocates. Ahmed (2012, 18-19) provides another example of this: if we are analysing the word 'house' and select a span of four, and the word appears in the environment of 'He went back to the house; when he opened the door, the dog barked', then the items 'went', 'back', 'to', 'the', 'when', 'he', 'opened' and 'the' should all be regarded as forming collocates within the node 'house'. However, according to Abbas Brashi (2005, 18-19), Mitchell (1971, 43) rejects Halliday's and Sinclair's separation of lexical study from grammar. Arguing for the 'oneness of grammar, lexis and meaning', Mitchell emphasises that collocations need to be described as 'lexico-grammatical' and should be studied within grammatical matrices as a way of clarifying collocational patterns; for example, adjective + noun ('heavy drinker'); verb + adverb ('drink heavily'); and adjective + gerund ('heavy drinking').

Generally speaking, linguists have studied the concept of collocation and its functions from semantic, lexical and grammatical perspectives. However, they have not widely discussed the semantic features of collocations or examined restricted collocations that are syntagmatically associated and include implicit or culturally specific meanings. For example, the collocation 'white noise' includes a syntagmatic relation with the allegorical meaning of a loud sound or an unvarying electrical noise, such as that unintentionally produced by a band of musicians. The question here is why, in this context, does the lexical item 'white' mean a loud musical sound when collocated with the word 'noise'? The reason for this is unknown and this kind of collocation is problematic for both translators and semanticists, indicating that there is a pressing need for further research into collocations, particularly restricted ones, from a semantic perspective.

4.3.1 Collocational meanings

The meaning of a collocation sometimes differs from that of its individual components; as such, it often possesses a unique meaning that may be difficult to recognise. As Palmer (1981, 76) notes, 'although collocation is very largely determined by meaning, it is sometimes fairly idiosyncratic and cannot easily be predicted in terms of the meaning of the associated words'. He illustrates his point with Porzig's (1934, 76-77) example, cited in Chapter One, of the adjective 'blond', a colour-related term which is highly restricted in its distribution and used only to refer to hair; we cannot speak of 'a blond door' or 'a blond dress'. The fact that the meaning of a collocate sometimes depends on the word with which it is associated is crucial in creating semantic units, as Baker (1992, 53) shows, noting that the word 'dry' can collocate with a range of words, including bread, wine, voice, sound and country. She explains that rendering the collocation 'a dry voice' as 'a voice which is not moist' would be a mistranslation of the word 'dry' in this context, since the phrase refers to the fact that someone's vocal delivery is devoid of emotional expression. Larson (1984, 141) states that 'it is the collocates that determine which sense is indicated in a given phrase or sentence […] [K]nowing which words go together is an important part of understanding the meaning of a text and translating it well.' He illustrates his point with the following example: the word 'dress' differs in meaning when used in the phrases 'to dress a chicken' and 'to dress a child': in the former it refers to plucking the feathers off a dead chicken before cooking it, while in the latter it means putting clothes on a child.

Furthermore, although there may appear to be a close equivalence between collocational patterns in two languages, they may not have the same meaning. Thus, 'to run a car' in English means to own, use or financially maintain a car, while in Greek the same phrase means to drive a car very fast (Baker, 1992, 54). Hence, although the same collocation can sometimes be found in two different languages, it can possess a different meaning according to the language in which it is expressed. This emphasises the fact that translators need to be aware of this potentially problematic issue and ensure they are familiar with the meaning of collocations in both languages, depending on their linguistic context, if they are to produce a successful renditon of source-language collocations in the target language.

4.3.2 Collocational restrictions

Abdul-Raof (2001) notes that when the meaning of an individual item is restricted to that particular combination, this can be thought of as a form of collocational restriction denoting the limitations placed on certain linguistic features when words are combined. He gives a number of examples in Arabic (2001, 32): verbs such as '*baka*' (to weep) and '*ibtisāma*' (to smile) can only be combined with nouns that enjoy the componential features '+ human + animate + _adult,' as in '*al-ṭifl*' (child) or '*al-musāfir*' (passenger); however, verbs such as '*takharaja*' (to graduate) and '*tazawwaja'* (to get married) are nouns with the semantic features '+ human + animate + adult', such as '*al-ṭālib*' (student). Understanding the componential semantic features of a given lexical item can help the translator to understand the collocational restrictions of a specific word.

Collocational restriction means that even though lexical items may be considered synonymous, it does not necessarily follow that they are interchangeable. Haas (1973, cited in Palmer, 1981, 134) notes that collocational restriction is best described in terms of tendencies rather than rules, and refers to those instances in which the selection of a synonymous or semi-synonymous item is not allowed in a lexical combination. Although both elements may be close in meaning they cannot be used interchangeably: for example, it is possible in English to 'throw a party' but not to 'throw a celebration'. Al-Sofi et al. (2014) further observe that the selectional restrictions of collocations differ from one language to another and this can create problems for translators. The English noun 'salary' collocates with the adjective 'fat', while in Arabic the noun can collocate with '*kabīr*' (big) (2014, 40).

Cruse (1986) and Palmer (1981) categorise collocational restrictions differently: Cruise's typology focuses on paradigmatic relations and Palmer's on syntagmatic relations. Cruise (1986, 281) distinguishes three different kinds of collocational restriction. He argues, firstly, that systematic collocational restrictions are completely specific, illustrating this with the verbs 'grill' and 'toast'. These refer to the same action from the point of view of the agent but include different subjects: 'items for grilling' means raw food while 'toasted food' refers to food that has already been cooked. Secondly, he identifies semi-systematic collocational restrictions which appear when some collocations have certain exceptions. For example, a 'customer' receives something material in exchange for money while a 'client' obtains a less tangible professional or technical service: thus, butchers, bakers and shoe shops have customers while architects and solicitors have clients. However, banks, which could be characterised as providing a service, call the people they deal with 'customers' rather than 'clients'. Finally, idiosyncratic collocational restrictions have a set of cognitive synonyms but are dissimilar in terms of collocational restrictions: for example, it is possible to say 'impeccable behaviour' but not 'flawless behaviour'.

Palmer (1981, 79) states that there are three kinds of collocational restriction. Firstly, there are some collocational restrictions that depend entirely on the meaning of the collocate. Secondly, some collocational restrictions are dependent on range – that is, some words such as the adjective 'pretty' can be combined with a large set of other words that share common semantic features in that they denote feminine characteristics. Thirdly, some collocational restrictions are not dependent on either meaning or range, such as the adjective 'addled', which only occurs in combinations that contain the words 'egg' or 'brain'. The key issue here is that collocational restrictions may vary between the source and target languages, posing challenges for the translator, as Izwaini acknowledges:

> When words have compatible collocational restrictions in both the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), rendering the collocation should not be problematic. If they are subject to different restrictions, then even changing one collocate can cause a loss of meaning. (Izwaini, 2016, 310)

4.3.3 Collocational clashes

Alan Healey et al. (1998, 72) state that to create 'a collocational clash is simply to put words together which sound unnatural to a native speaker'. Abdul-Raof (2001, 29) further reminds us that 'some collocations are language-specific. Therefore, lexical collocational errors take

place between speakers of different languages when they put words together in the wrong context.' He illustrates this with an example: in English the noun 'envy' collocates with the adjective 'green', and this collocation has a neutral connotative meaning, while in Arabic the noun 'envy' collocates with the adjective 'black' and this denotes a negative connotative meaning. However, it can be argued that this example is not well chosen as the collocation 'green with envy' does not possess a neutral connotative meaning in English, thus both these collocations in Arabic and English entail negative connotative meanings, further proof that the scholar or translator needs to possess a very wide and detailed knowledge of both languages. Abdul-Raof (2001,72), however, offers more apposite examples: the adjective 'heavy', for instance, is commonly used in English to collocate with a whole number of nouns including rain, fire, shelling/bombardment, fighting, weight, seas, blow, smoker, industry, losses/casualties, traffic, eyes and meal. However, Arabic uses different adjectives to collocate with these nouns, and the word 'heavy' (*thaqīl*) can only collocate with artillery, weight, meal and industry.

Larson (1984, 146) explains that collocational clashes occur when there are grammatical or lexical collocational errors, and provides an example from a letter written by a publisher who is a non-native speaker of English: 'We have sent the book […] [W]e are sorry for the overlook.' Larson notes that the use of the verb 'overlook' in this case represents a collocational clash in English, and the noun 'oversight' should have been used instead. He also highlights the fact that some collocations may be acceptable in one language but do not make sense in another; however, he notes that collocations such as 'black noise', 'noisy silence', 'the water walked' or 'he ate water' would produce collocational clashes in most languages (1984, 147). Baker (1992, 54) gives the example of the English collocation 'break the law', which cannot be rendered literally into Arabic; the equivalent Arabic collocation would be *'yakhriq al-qānūn*' ('contradict the law'). Translators need to be aware of the problems of collocational clashes, particularly in the case of idiomatic language, and they should not adopt a literal translation method in these instance. Larson warns:

> The translator must constantly be alert to the potential pitfall of collocational clashes in the translation. To avoid this, he will consider as suspect any word not used in its primary sense. If translated literally, it will probably cause a clash. (Larson 1984, 147)

This is one of the reasons why translating culturally specific collocations in the Quran literally can sometimes produce unacceptable collocations in the target language.

Nevertheless, Larson (1984, 146) also explains that problems sometimes arise due to cultural rather than collocational clashes. For example, in the Angor culture of Papua New Guinea, the women always take the lead when walking along a trail, and the men follow, while in India, the opposite principle applies. If someone translates from one of the Indian languages into Angor and the text says, 'the men went first', Larson advises the translator to leave the expression as it is, without any changes, as the cultural clash cannot be avoided. However, in this case, the translator should add a phrase in the target language, such as 'according to Indian custom', for clarification. In the case of cultural clashes, however, there are different techniques that can be applied to the translation, depending on the context and situation. Sometimes the source text includes cultural-bound expressions, which may not be understood by the target reader if transferred literally because, as Gideon Toury (1995, 27) notes, 'culture always entails some change'. Al-Jabari (2008, 68-69) uses the example of Shakespeare's eighteenth sonnet 'Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?' (1592). A summer's day has a positive connotative meaning in English culture (the sun shines, the day is warm and the landscape is covered in flowers), but it has a far less positive connotation in Arabic culture as summer days are extremely hot in Arab countries, and the strong sun withers plants and flowers. Thus, in order to achieve a similar effect in Arabic, Shakespeare's lover would have to be compared with a waterfall or a cool breeze, or something else denoting beauty and pleasure in the culture of the target language.

4.3.4 Collocation is (not) an idiom: differences among linguists

The distinction between collocations and idioms has proven a controversial issue among linguists. Some, such as Wallace (1979), Sinclair (1991) and Smith (1947) (cited in Brashi, 2005, 20-21) argue that there are no differences between collocations and idioms. According to Brashi (2005), Wallace (1979) does not distinguish between collocations, proverbs and idioms, arguing that collocations such as 'to be honest with' and proverbs such as 'do not count your chickens before they are hatched' are subcategories of idioms. Brashi (2005) also notes that Sinclair (1991, 170), who defines collocation as 'the occurrence of two or more words within a short space of each other in a text', views collocations as idiomatic expressions in which two words are regularly combined together for the purpose of emphasis, citing 'over and over' (emphatic repetition), 'fair and square' (emphasis by rhyme) and 'heads or tails' (emphasis through two contrasting words) as examples.

However, Cruse (1986), Emery (1991), Abdullah Shakir and Mohammed Farghal (1992), and Baker (2011) all contend that collocations are neither idiomatic expressions nor free combinations. Cruise (1986, 37-40) clarifies the distinction, referring to an idiom as 'an expression whose meaning cannot be inferred from the meanings of its parts'. He adds that 'an idiom is a lexical complex which is semantically simplex' while a collocation refers to 'sequences of lexical items which habitually co-occur, but which are nonetheless fully transparent in the sense that each lexical constituent is also a semantic constituent'.

Emery (1991, 25), meanwhile, states that in a collocation each lexeme is a constituent, and therefore a collocation is in fact both semantically and lexically complex. He maintains that varying degrees of commutability and opacity are often found in idioms and collocations, citing Cowie's (1983: xii) examples of the idioms, 'to burn one's boats/ bridges' and 'to catch fire' (1991, 25). It could be argued that the second example seems to be a collocation not an idiom. In English, there are numerous collocations with the verb 'to catch', including 'catch cold', 'catch a bus', 'catch you later' and 'catch someone's eye'. Under normal circumstances, an idiomatic form cannot be changed, whereas a collocation can: for example, the phrase 'the bridges have been burnt' could refer to a city that has been invaded by an army that has literally burnt the city's bridges rather than meaning (metaphorically) that all avenues of retreat from a situation are closed.

Baker (2011) clearly distinguishes between collocations, idioms and set expressions, observing that while collocations may allow for variation in form, under normal circumstances idioms and set expressions do not, as they are frozen patterns of language which often carry meanings that cannot be deduced from their individual components. However, she observes that idioms, like collocations, may also pose translation difficulties due to their culturally specific nature, illustrating this point with an example from Kishtainy's (1985) book on Arab political humour, which relates a joke told in the wake of Israel's defeat of Arab forces and its seizure of Arab territory in 1967: Egypt's commander-in-chief, Field-Marshal Amin, is horrified to see President Nasser ordering a tattoo artist to inscribe the names of all the territories seized by Israel on his right arm. When Amin asks the president why he is doing this, Nasser responds: 'Lest I should forget them.' Amin then asks: 'What will you do if we get them back?', and the president replies: 'If we get them back, I'll cut off my right arm'. Baker explains that unless you are an Arabic speaker, you cannot understand this joke, which relies on an idiom which is similar in meaning to the phrase 'pigs might fly' in English.

4.3.5 Classification of English collocations

English linguists such as Robert Robins (1964), Newmark (1995), Marijana Macis and Norbert Schmitt (2017), Ronald Carter (1998), Morton Benson (1985) and Yasuko Obana (1993) offer a range of views about types of collocations. Newmark's, Benson's and Obana's classifications are similar to each other, as they focus on grammatical and lexical structures. Newmark (1988, 114-16), taking a linguistic perspective, separates collocations into paradigmatic and syntagmatic types. The former are based on well-established hierarchies such as kinship, as in 'fathers and sons', or colours, as in 'emerald is bright green', while the latter consist of seven groups. He focuses on the three most common types of syntagmatic collocations: (1) adjective and noun – for example, 'heavy labour'; (2) noun and noun – for example, 'nerve cell'; and (3) verb and noun – for example, 'pay a visit' (1995, 212-14). Obana (1993), meanwhile, divides collocations into structural and semantic categories. A structural collocation is a lexical cohesion implying two lexical items that are structurally related: for instance, the word 'die' can collocate with 'John', as in 'John died', but the word 'spoon' cannot structurally collocate with 'die', as in 'the spoon died'. Semantic collocation is a type of lexical cohesion in which the components are semantically relevant to each other – for example, 'dog' and 'bark', and 'candle' and 'flicker' (1993, 493). Benson (1985, 61-66) also separates the different sorts of collocation but into grammatical and lexical types. The first, grammatical collocation, consists of a dominant word (a verb, noun or adjective) followed by a grammatical word, typically a preposition, as in the following examples:

Verb-preposition combination (prepositional verbs): 'abide by', 'aim at'

Noun-preposition combination: 'access to', 'accusation against'

Verb-participle combination (phrasal verbs): 'bring about', 'catch on'

The second type, lexical collocation, consists of two equal lexical components, as in the examples:

Noun-verb combinations: 'bells ring', 'blood circulates/flows', 'bees buzz/sting/swarm', 'birds chirp/fly/sing'

By contrast, Robins (1964), Carter (1998), and Macis and Schmitt (2017) categorise collocations from the semantic perspective. Robins (1964: 66) identifies two types of collocation. The first is based on the situational meaning of words such as 'white coffee' or

‘white wine’, in which the colour is not used to refer to its referent. The second type Robin entitles ‘referential meanings’, citing Firth’s example (1957) that in the collocation ‘dark night’, in which one meaning of ‘night’ is its collatability with ‘dark’ and vice versa. Carter (1998: 70), on the other hand, refers to four different types of collocation: first (and most common) are unrestricted collocations, such as ‘to take a look’ or ‘to run a business’; second are semi-restricted collocations, which include a number of items which come with certain syntactic slots, as in ‘to harbour a grudge’; thirdly are familiar collocations that occur regularly, as in ‘lukewarm reception’; and the last type, restricted collocations, contain more closed or fixed words. This last category is ‘generally (and justifiably) believed to be the most difficult part of the lexicon both for lexicographic presentation and for second-language teaching/acquisition’ (Sandomirskaya and Oparina, 1996, 273).

Macis and Schmitt (2017, 51) categorise collocations into three different types. First, literal collocations, where two lexical items produce a collocation with a literal meaning that can be easily understood, such as ‘powerful computer’; however, the difficulty lies in recognising which words can collocate to produce a particular meaning – for example, ‘strong’ or ‘tough’ cannot collocate with ‘computer’. The second type, figurative collocations, carry implicit meanings that cannot be arrived at through studying their component items – for example, ‘a hot ticket’ does not mean a ticket with a high temperature but one that is highly sought after. As such, ‘hot ticket’ behaves like a ‘chunk’ or single unit of text rather than two words that collocate together. The third type, duplex collocations, are polysemous and thus include literal and figurative meanings – for example, ‘top drawer’ has a literal meaning (e.g. ‘the uppermost drawer in a cabinet’) but it also has a figurative meaning (e.g. something that is the best of its class, as in ‘he bought a top-drawer car’).

To conclude, it is more beneficial to focus on classifying collocations on semantic rather than syntactic grounds, as there are a few studies a bout these types of collocations, which are considered linguistic phenomenon that have no specific rules to grasp their meaning. These collocations are usually idiosyncratic include metaphorical meanings. Carter (1998) and Macis and Schmitt (2017), for instance, refer to important types of collocations, including restricted, figurative and duplex collocations, that often pose problems for translators and semanticists who fail to grasp their implicit meaning. Macis and Schmitt give the example, mentioned above, of a ‘hot ticket’, in which the two collocates behave as a single unit, making this type of collocation more difficult to recognise. Translators, therefore,

need to be aware of the different types of collocations that occur (in either language) in order to transfer their meaning suitably from the source into the target labguage.

4.4 Linguistic theory of Arabic collocations

Arabic has a rich vocabulary, containing a wealth of collocations that are variants with different forms and meanings. As Hasan Ghazala (2007, 7) shows, a single collocation in English can sometimes be translated into four or five different forms in Arabic, all with the same meaning: for example, 'good reason' can be rendered in Arabic as '*sabab wajīh*','*sabab menṭiqī*','*sabab maʿqūl*','*sabab qawī*' and *'sabab maqbūl*'. He adds that Arabic collocations can consist of expressive phrases, including metaphors, idiomatic expressions and proverbs, and provides two examples: '*fī baḥr*' (literally, 'in the sea'), which means 'during/through', and '*bishiq al-ʾanfus*' (literally, 'to crack or split one's self') meaning 'with extreme difficulty' (2007, 7-8). According to El-Gemei (2006), in the past, Arab philologists identified collocations as a linguistic phenomenon but did not study them separately, either examining them contextually or as part of lexicography. A number of monolingual thesauri of collocations have been produced by philologists, such as *Al-Yaziji's Najʿat Ar-rā'id* (1970), *Al-Hamadani's Kitāb Al-Alfaz* (1989) and *Al-Thaʿalibi's Fiqh Al-lugha* (1981). Each of these books is organised into different conceptual topics, including collocations, vocabulary, expressions and synonyms. However, Arabic collocations only began to be studied independently in the mid-1960s when Abu-AlFaraj (1966) first introduced Arab readers to the concept through his entries in these monolingual dictionaries. She refers to Firth's (1951, 125) definition of a collocation as 'an abstraction at the syntagmatic level [that] is not directly concerned with the conceptual […] approach to the meanings of words', agreeing with Firth that the meaning of a lexical item is produced by collocation.

Some theorists, such as El-Gemei (2006), argue that these collocations are determined by semantic relations, whereas others assert that they are determined by grammar. El-Gemei (2006, 435) discusses the work of two Arab linguists: Ezzat (1971) and El-Hassan (1982). The former argues that a collocation (*al-muṣāḥabah allughawīyah*) is a linguistic co-occurance that refers to the phenomenon of a lexical item occurring in the company of another, adding that when one of the constituents of a collocation is mentioned, the other one immediately springs to mind – for example, if the lexical item '*jumʿa*' (Friday) is given, a native Arabic speaker can easily list other collocates, such as '*ṣalāt*' (prayer) as in *'ṣalāt al-jumʿa*' (Friday prayers) – and he also notes that collocational patterns vary from one language

to another. El-Hassan (1982), meanwhile, refers to collocation in Arabic as *talazum* (restricted co-occurance), identifying three types of semantic relations in Quranic collocations. The first is an antonymous relation, such as the verb *'yuḥī'* ('He [Allah] raises to life') and its antonymic form '*yumyt*' ('He [Allah] puts to death/slays'), the collocate in '*yuḥī wa yumīt*' (1982, 40, 68). The second semantic collocational relationship is synonymous; that is, two collocants carry the same meaning, as in the terms *'al-mustaqar and walmuqām*' (literally, 'the settling and residing place'). The third is a complementary relation in Quranic collocations, where the meaning of one collocate complements the meaning of the other, as in *'as-samā walʾarḍ*' ('heaven and earth'). According to El-Gemei (2006), all three theorists mentioned above (Abu-AlFaraj, Ezzat and El-Hassan) conclude that grammar cannot account for this linguistic phenomenon and that collocations are either determined by semantic relations or are arbitrary.

El-Hassan's (1982) classification of Quranic collocation as a semantic relation can be amplified by describing it as a semantic *denotative* relation since these collocations can be identified literally. However, semantic *connotative* relations are also important in this context. In this type of collocation, one lexical item has a literal meaning while the other includes a metaphorical or culturally specific meaning, and this can sometimes pose difficulties for translators, who can struggle to convey the collocation's meaning. For example, the phrase '*ʾawlyāʾ of Allah*' is a Quranic collocation consisting of a culturally specific lexical item plus a literal lexical item, as in the example of the word '*ʾawlyāʾ*', which is a plural of the singular '*waly*', meaning someone who follows the orders of Allah and abstains from all bad deeds – literally, 'someone who is close to Allah'. Most native Arabic speakers would be aware of this term but it would be difficult for target readers to grasp its intended meaning unless they were specialists in Islamic studies, because it is not necessarily part of their culture. Another semantic connotative relation can entail two constituents with metaphorical or culturally specific meanings, as in the Quranic collocations 'the white thread' and 'the black thread' (Surah 2: 187), which refer to the light of dawn appearing on the horizon after the darkness of the night (see Chapter Two). Such terms need to be explained by adding a footnote or a commentary as part of the translation process.

The third level of semantic collocation mentioned by El-Hassan (1982) does not seem obvious since any two lexical items can be considered as complements for each other. Thus, in the example of the antonymous term '*yuḥī wa yumīt*', one collocate completes the other as well: here, Allah describes Himself as the one who can bestow life and take it away. The

Quranic collocation *'ar-raḥman ar-raḥīm*' ('the most merciful, the most gracious') could be classified as a semantic level of synonymous constituents as another good example of a semantic collocation.

According to El-Gemei (2006: 435-36), Ibn Faris (1974) attempted to show that grammar rather than semantics determines collocations. In the phrase '*al-ʾIttibāʿ wa-lmuz āwaja*', Ibn Faris illustrates how collocation is influenced by grammar, using the term *ʾittibāʿ* (literally, 'following') to describe how one or two lexical items may be followed by other lexical items with the same root. He categorises two types of *al-ʾittibāʿ*. In the first, a lexical item is followed by a meaningful lexical item that derives from the same root but a different system: for example, in the collocation *'sādiq sadūq*', the first lexical item is followed by the 'ism' which is the object, a passive participle coming from the same root that literally means 'a friend' or 'very friendly' – that is, a true friend (1974, 435). The other example is *'laylun layyl'* (literally, 'nighting night') – that is, a very long night. In this case, the lexical item is followed by the 'ism' which is the subject, an active principle – *layyl* with the same root 'l-y-l' (1974, 435). In the second type of *ʾittibāʿ*, Ibn Faris shows how the second lexical item is used to create a rhyme, which in itself may be meaningless. For example, in the collocation *'shaiṭānun layṭān'* (literally, 'devilish Satan'), the second lexical item does not add any meaning but rhymes with the first lexical item ending in '*ṭān*' (1974, 436). El-Gemei (2006) argues that the occurrence of the phenomenon of *ʾittibāʿ* in Arabic serves two functions: it emphasises the meaning of the first lexical item and it produces an aesthetic musical response arising from the repetition of the same root.

El-Gemei (2006) notes that another Arabic theorist, Hassan (1986), developed grammatical rules for Arabic collocations when he introduced and explained their sectional restrictions. Hassan uses the term '*tawāred and mulāʾma*' (appropriateness) to refer to the lexical items that are grammatically and semantically acceptable in collocations. He asserts that the Arabic grammatical rule '*mfʿūl muṭlaq*' (cognate accusative) requires that a verb should be followed by a '*maṣdar*' (infinitive verbal noun) of the same root, as in *'sāra sayran*' (literally, 'he walked walking') where the word '*sayran*' is derived from the root's-y-r' (object absolute). The other grammatical rule of '*tawkīd lafẓ*' (verbal corroboration) involves the repetition of a lexical item for emphasis, as in '*shaiṭān shaiṭān*' (literally, 'devil devil'). Hassan also sheds light on the semantic or logical approach to collocation that holds that a clause in Arabic that starts with the '*mubtada*' (topic or subject) of a nominal sentence would be logically followed by a '*khabar'* (predicate). Conversely, if a verbal clause begins with the

verb *ʻsāra*' (he walked), then it would be expected to have a noun that is animate following the verb, as in *ʻsāra ar-rajul*' or 'the man walked' (literally, 'walked the man'). However, if the verb is followed by an inanimate noun such as '*māʾida*' (table), as in *ʻsārat al-māʾida*' (literally, 'walked the table'), this would be grammatically acceptable but semantically unacceptable. Many different syntactic collocation combinations are possible in Arabic, leading to arbitrary patterns of collocations with independent meanings.

4.5 Classification of Arabic collocations

Theorists such as Emery (1991), Hassan (1973), El-Hassan (1982), Al-Qasimi (1979) and Izwaini (2016) categorise Arabic collocations differently depending on whether they view them from a lexical and grammatical or a semantic perspective. Emery (1991), for example, categorises collocations from a semantic viewpoint, while the other scholars take a grammatical and lexical perspective, giving different names to the different types of collocation. Emery argues that each lexical constituent in a collocation is a sematic constituent, meaning that a collocation is both semantically and lexically complex. He proposes the following categorisation of Arabic collocations (1991, 61-62). The first type are **'**open collocations'. In these combinations, Emery observes that both elements (verb and object or adjective and noun) are freely recombinable and each element is used in a common literal sense, and illustrates this with the following example: '*badaʾat/ʾintahat/ al-ḥarb/al-maʿrakah*' ('the war/battle + began/ended').

The second type of collocation, according to Emery's categorisation, is the 'restricted collocation'. He notes that Aisenstadt (1979, 71) defined restricted collocations as 'combinations of two or more words used in one of their regular, non-idiomatic meanings, following certain structural patterns, and restricted in their commutability not only by grammatical and semantical valency (like the components of so-called free word-combinations), but also by usage', whereas Cowie (1983, xiii) states that 'in such combinations [...] one word […] has a figurative sense not found outside that limited context'. Emery (1991, 60) believes that both these views are compatible since in a restricted collocation one of the elements may be either literal or figurative, and he illustrates this point with Cowie's examples: 'explode + a myth/a belief' and 'clench + one's teeth/fists'. In the first combination, the verb is figurative, while in the second, it is literal. Emery observes that in the second combination, 'clench one's teeth' could be used in a wholly figurative way, like 'grit one's teeth', and it would then be analysed as an idiom. He adds that Cowie (1981)

confirms that the selection of the specialised meaning of the verb in the first combination is contextually determined as 'explode', which here means 'to disprove'. This figurative image only occurs within the lexical context of this specific combination. Emery provides further examples of restricted collocations that occur in various types of syntactic configuration: for example, subject/verb, as in '*indalaʿat/nashabat + al-ḥarb/al-maʿrakah*' (the war/battle + broke out/flared up) and adjective/noun, as in '*ḥarb/maʿrakah + ṭāḥinah/shaʿwā/ḍarūs*' (devastating/damaging + war/battle) and '*jarīmah/ʾibtisāmah + nakrā*' (vicious + crime/smile). To the best of my knowledge, however, there is no such term in Arabic as 'a vicious smile', although it could be 'a malicious smile'. Emery notes that collocations like '*harb ṭāḥinah*' (literally, 'grinding war'] does not merge into single semantic units and the figurative extensions are language-specific and unpredictable. Thus, second-language speakers face difficulties when seeking an equivalent translation.

The third type of collocation is the 'bound collocation'. According to Emery (1991), Cowie (1981, 228) describes this type of collocation as 'a bridge category between collocations and idioms', meaning that one of the constituent elements is selective of the other. The selecting element includes a specific meaning, as in Cowie's examples, 'foot + the bill' and 'curry + favour', but Arabic's derivational richness permits a particular root/pattern of a combination to be designated for a specific collocant. In the example, '*shamaraʿn*' + '*sāʿidīhi*' ('he bared' + 'his forearm'), a non-figurative verb collocates uniquely with a specific part of the body. Emery explains that bound collocations can sometimes imply idiomatic meanings: for example, '*shamaraʿn sāʿidīhi'* commonly carries the meaning of 'getting down to work'. The last type of collocation is the 'idiom'. Emery observes that this category is completely different from the previous types of collocation in that the constituent elements of idioms are opaque and are used together in a specialised sense to form a single semantic unit. He notes, however, that this obscurity is not necessarily innate: in some idioms, a literal translation may co-exist with the figurative sense. Idioms can be divided into sememic and lexemic units; the latter are more commonly referred to as compounds, and in this case, neither of the elements retains its literal meaning, with the unit referring to a single specific referent, as in the following example: '*al-ḥarb al-bāridah*' (the Cold War).

Unlike Emery, Hassan (1973), El-Hassan (1982) and Al-Qasimi (1979) classify collocations from lexical and grammatical perspectives. According to Nofal (2012, 84), Hassan (1973, 84) uses the term 'referential collocations' for those phrases in which one lexical item is mentioned and the other one is simply referred to and has to be understood

from the given context. He provides the following example from Surah 17: 7: '*wa lyadkhulū al-masjida kama dakhalūhuʾawala marratin*' ('And to enter your Temple as they had entered it before'). Nofal states that in this verse the word '*al-masjid*' (mosque) is a reference to '*al-masjid al-aqṣa*'. It could be argued that Nofal's translation of this verse is unhelpful in this particular case, as the word 'temple' bears no direct connection to the word 'mosque'.

El-Hasan (1982, 276, cited in Nofal, 2012, 86) lists three categories of Arabic collocations. The first he calls 'oppositional collocations': for example, '*al-sharq walgharb*' (east and west) and '*al-ḥayāt walmawt*' (life and death). According to El-Hasan, the second type, 'synonymous collocations', are used for emphasis, and the Quran contains many examples of this type: for example, '*qāla ʾinnamā ʾashkū bathī wa-ḥuznī ʾilā llāhi*' ('I complain to Allah about my grief and sadness') (Surah 12: 86). El-Hasan explains that the word *'bathī*' (my grief) refers to a deep sorrow that is lodged in the heart, and therefore the English phrase, 'my grief and sadness', conveys almost the same meaning. The third and final type of collocation he refers to as 'variable synonymous collocations'. Here, the verbs '*jalasa*', '*baraka*' and '*jathama*' are all synonymous references to the act of sitting; however, each one possesses its own collocates. Thus, '*jalasa*' collocates with human subjects, as in the example, 'the teacher sat down', while '*baraka*' collocates with camels, translated into English as 'the camel knelt', and '*jathama*' collocates with birds, as in 'the sparrow perched'. All these variable synonymous collocations consist of a verb + a noun.

Al-Qasimi (1979, cited in Nofal, 2012, 85) identifies the following types of Arabic lexical collocations: conjunctive expressions, as in '*at-taʿāwin wath-thaʾāzir*' ('assistance and cooperation'); quantitative specifications, as in '*ʿadad kabīr*' ('a great number of'); qualitative specifications, as in '*ila ḥadden baʿīd*' ('to a large extent'); and locative expressions, as in '*fī kul makan*' ('everywhere'). He further mentions the following grammatical collocations: noun-adjective, for example, '*al-waṭan al-arabī*' ('the Arab world'); verb-preposition, for example, '*ʾastafsaraʿan*' ('to inquire about'); adjective-preposition, for example, '*murtabaṭ bī*' ('related to'); and participle-preposition, for example, '*assaʾī*' ('seeking for'). According to Nofal (2012, 85), Al-Qasimi argues that one of the characteristics of Arabic collocations is that their meaning can be recognised from their individual elements: for example, '*kharq al-muʿāhada*' means '*ʾuntuhikat al-ʾittifāqīyah*' ('break a treaty'). He adds that a similar word can be used as a substitute for each individual lexical item in an Arabic collocation and it will still retain its meaning, but it cannot be replaced by one word: for example, '*jamaʿ mina al-junūd*' can be used as a substitute for

‘*thulah mina al-jīsh*’ (literally, ‘a group of armed men/a group of soldiers’). On the other hand, idioms can be replaced by one word but the individual words in the idiom cannot: for example, ‘*qāba qawsīni au adna*’ can replace ‘*qarīban*’ (‘soon’) but ‘ʿ*anbikrat abīhim*’ cannot be replaced by ‘ʿ*anbikrat wālidīhim*’ (‘all of them’).

Izwaini (2016, 313-16) has also produced a categorisation of Arabic collocations, observing that there can be a great variation in the number of ways in which words can combine with one another. Thus, the adjective ‘*jayyd*’ (‘good’) can collocate with a large number of nouns, while the verb ‘*ajhasha*’ (‘embark on’) has only one known collocate, ‘*buka*’ (‘weeping’) (2016, 312). To the best of my knowledge, the literal meaning of ‘embark’, in English, describes the act of boarding a ship or beginning a task, so in this case, the English equivalent of the collocation could be ‘to break down in tears’. Izwaini identifies the first collocational type as ‘grammatical collocations’; these include the range of different grammatical combinations that exist in Arabic, selected examples of which are coordinated nouns, such as ‘*sirb ṭuyūr*’ (‘a flock of birds’) and verb + verb combinations, such as ‘*ṣāla wajāl*’ (‘to jump up and roam about’). In the case of noun-verb collocations, a noun can be modified by a negated verb phrase: for example, ‘*danbun lā yughtafar*’ (‘a fault that cannot be forgiven’) or ʾ*īmān la yatazaḥzaḥ*’ (‘a faith that cannot be shaken’). Following this, Izwaini briefly focuses on the second type or what he calls ‘compound collocations’; this refers to lexical units that consist of more than one collocation that can co-occur either with a lexical item or with one another. The structure of the compound collocation (CC) can be introduced as CC [verb + collocation (noun + adjective)] – as seen in the following example. *ʿghaṭṭa fī nawminʿamīq*’ (‘he has fallen into a deep sleep’). The adjective ‘ʿ*amīq*’ collocates with the noun ‘*nawm*’ and the verb ‘*ghaṭṭa*’ co-occurs with this adjective + noun collocation as a whole. Izwaini also introduces ‘culture-specific collocations’, noting that culture plays a major role in structuring collocations and that the Arabic language is closely interconnected with Islamic culture. He illustrates this point with the the following examples: ‘*aqāma al-ṣalāt*’ (‘to practise praying’) and ‘*hajja al-bīt*’ (‘to go on a pilgrimage’). The author notes that this cultural aspect also contributes to the production of special collocations, such as ‘*mutaʿaṭṭish lil sulṭah*’ (‘thirsty for power’), explaining that thirst is a natural sensation in a geographical area that is, for the most part, hot and dry; in contrast, the standard collocation in English would be ‘hungry for power’. The fourth type of Arabic collocations Izwaini identifies are ‘loan collocations’. He observes that most new collocations are the result of calque translations, which have become common in modern standard Arabic (MSA). He

provides two examples: '*jawdahʿālīyah*' ('high quality') and '*ghasal al-ʾamwāl*' ('money laundering').

To conclude, the theorists mentioned above have focused mainly on Arabic grammatical and lexical collocations that are variants of English collocations, although they have also identified a few types of semantic collocation that hold a deeper meaning. Emery (1991) has also presented what he terms 'restricted' and 'bound' collocations – the former combines a figurative collocant with one that possesses a literal sense, while the latter includes idiomatic meaning, as illustrated by the example shown above of '*shamaraʿn*' + '*saʿidīhi*' ('he bared' + 'his forearm'), meaning 'to get down to work'. This type of collocant appears to work as a single item. Meanwhile, Izwaini (2016) has identified culturally specific collocations; however, he introduces these as lexical combinations, giving as an example the Islamic cultural expression '*aqāma aṣ-ṣalāt*' ('to practise praying') – such collocants can be recognised through their literal translation. I would argue that if Izwaini had investigated this type of collocation from a semantic perspective, he would have encompassed their metaphorical meaning. In order to address this omission, the current research therefore presents its study of collocations using a semantic framework, focusing mainly on the culturally specific collocations found in the Quran and analysing their various types of syntactic configuration.

4.6 A comparison of Arabic and English systems of collocation

Given that the nature of collocations and the combinations they involve often differs greatly from one language to another, it can be no surprise that Arabic and English lexemes are subject to major variations. For example, the Arabic collocation noun + noun '*qamar iṣṭināʿī*' (literally, 'artificial moon') corresponds to a single-word equivalent in English ('satellite'). Furthermore, the meaning of acollocate in Arabic depends on the word with which it is associated – as it does in English. Izwaini (2016, 310) illustrates this with an example: the collocational pattern of the verb '*ḍaraba*' with the noun '*al-ṭabl*' (drum) means 'to beat a drum', whereas if it is collocated with the noun '*mathal*' (example), it would be translated in English as 'to cite an example'.

In Nofal's (2012) analysis of the similarities and differences between Arabic and English collocations, he observes that English collocations are relatively limited when compared with Arabic ones, and warns that students, teachers and translators may experience

difficulties in recognising or finding a target-language equivalent. Nofal explains that the term ‘collocation’ in both these languages refers to the habitual co-occurrence of lexical items and these combinations are a type of syntagmatic lexical relation. He also argues that in both languages there are many totally restricted collocations: for example, the expression ‘*khalf al-nāqah’* (‘the breast of a female camel’) in Arabic and the term ‘spick and span’ in English. In addition, in both languages, some verbs within collocations can be substituted with equivalent verbs, as in the example where ‘to perpetrate murder’ can be substituted for ‘to commit murder’; likewise in Arabic, ‘*artakaba jurman’* (‘to commit a crime’) can be substituted for ‘*aqtarafa jurman*’. As well as these similarities, both languages contain lexemes that are variants of other lexemes: for instance, in English, the adjective ‘heavy’ may have many different meanings according to its collocates, while Arabic uses a different range of adjectives. Nofal (2012, 88) provides the following examples:

heavy rain	*maṭar ghazīr*
heavy sleep	*subāt ʿamīq*
heavy smoker	*mudakhn mufrṭ*
heavy fog	*ḍabāb kathīf*

Nofal argues that the main difference between Arabic and English lies in the fact that they are completely different language families which reflect dissimilar cultures, and the language cannot be separated from the culture from which it springs. Therefore, translators, as well as teachers and students of these languages, need to be aware of the close relationship between language and culture, and its consequent effect on both the teaching and translation process.

Ghalal (2015, 21) also points to the differences in collocations between English and Arabic languages and the way these often create significant problems in translation, observing that Arabic may use multiple collocational forms to express a single English form, as seen in the following examples:

horse’s hoof	*ḥāfirul-ḥiṣān*
cow’s hoof	*ẓulful-baqarah*
camel’s hoof	*khufful-baʿīr*
tall buildings	*mabānī shāhiqah*
tall mountains	*jibālun shāmikhah*
tall trees	*nakhlun bāsiqāt*

Thus, while the word 'hoof' collocates with three animals in English (horse, cow and camel), Arabic has a special collocational term for each animal so that '*ḥāfir*' belongs to '*ḥiṣān*' (horse), '*ẓulf*' to '*baqarah*' (cow) and '*khuff*' to '*baʿīr*' (camel). Likewise, the adjective 'tall' in English can collocate with buildings, mountains or trees; however, in Arabic, each noun requires a different adjective: '*mabānī*' (buildings) collocates with '*shāhiqah*'; '*jibāl*' (mountains) collocates with '*shāmikhah*'; and '*nakhl'* (trees) collocates with '*bāsiqāt*'.

Quranic discourse, however, gives rise to a further linguistic phenomenon in which the same word can acquire a different meaning depending on the very specific context in which it is used. Nassimi (2008, 39) believes that, due to this, '[t]he translation of the Quran is a highly delicate and extremely difficult task to undertake. The translation process has to be based on the fact that the output will be an interpretation of the underlying meanings of the Quran rather than a substitution for the original text.' For example, Pickthall (1930: 1938) renders the Quranic collocation '*albayt al-ʿatīq*' in (22: 29) literally as 'the Ancient House', a translation that could confuse the target reader if the phrase is not understood as a reference to the Ka'ba. Al-Hilali and Khan (1974), meanwhile, translate the collocation freely, rendering it into English with the paraphrase 'the Ancient House, the Ka'bah at Makkah'. In this case, these authors have adopted a good translation technique, using a calque (a literal translation) – a technique to raise the reader's awareness – with a back translation of the original, and referring to the intended meaning of the collocation in a paraphrase.

To sum up, the insights afforded above show that Arabic and English collocations are extremely diverse and a large number of them tend to be what can be called 'bound' and 'restricted collocations', particularly when they occur in the Quran. There are some similarities as well as differences in collocations, but Arabic has more numerous syntactic combinations, and translators need to be aware of the collocational range of both the Arabic and English languages. More importantly, they need to understand the less obvious cultural meanings that collocations can include in order to convey this correctly to the target readership in an effective manner. Also, words that collocate in one language may not operate in the same way in another language, and translators need to be guided by the collocational environment of a word rather than being wholly dependent on the meaning(s) of the word as provided by a dictionary.

4.7 Classification of collocations in the Quran

Ghazalah (2014, 305-10) has presented a typology of collocations in the Quran as grammatico-lexical collocations, suggesting that these should be considered from two main perspectives: firstly, a lexical-semantic perspective, focusing on the probability of finding an equivalent meaning in the target language and how much loss/gain of meaning is involved; and secondly, a grammatical-semantic perspective that considers the extent to which their source language structures can be reproduced or breached in the target language. The following examples show this at work:

Noun + adjective → adjective noun
Quran karīm (the Holy Koran)
al-lawḥ al-maḥfūḍ (the Preserved Tablet)

Noun + noun → noun + noun (genitive)
dulūk as-shamsi (the declining of the sun; midday)
awlal-al-bāb (men of understanding)

Noun + noun: topic and comment
Allah laṭīfun biʿibādihi (God is all gentle to his Servants)
al-jibāla awtāda (the mountains are stakes)

Assertive noun + noun: appositive collocations
kafaratun fajara (disbelievers, wicked)
Harona ʾakhī (Aaron, my brother)

Noun + and + noun: synonymous collocations
ar-rawḥu war-rayḥān (repose and happiness)
an-nūru wal-ʾīmān (light and faith)

Noun + and + noun collocations
al-mālu wal-banūn (possessions and offspring)

Verb + noun → verb noun (verb + object)
sāʾsabīla (it is the most detestable way)
ḍāqa darʿn (feel straitened)

Verb + subject collocations → (subject + verb)

tabāraka Allah (Blessed is God; God is Blessed)

faṣalat al-ʿīr (the caravan departed)

Verb + and + verb collocations

fakkara wa-qaddara (he thought and then plotted)

tuṭahirahum wa-tuzakīhim (purify and cleanse them)

Double-negative collocations

lā tubqi wala tadar (it neither spares nor leaves alone)

lā tajūʿa wala taʿra (you neither hunger nor be unclothed)

Emphatic cognate object collocations: absolute object

rujat rajjan (shaken with a severe shake)

bust bassan (powdered to dust, crumbled to powder)

Verb + preposition collocations

dammara Allah ʿalīhim (God destroyed them completely vs. God destroyed them)

amṭarna ʿalīhim maṭarn/*amṭarna maṭarn* (we rained down upon them (evil) vs. we rained down rain)

Passive verb + preposition collocations

zuḥziḥa ʿan an-nāri (removed away from fire)

sīqa ila al-jannah (driven from Paradise)

Reversive collocations

shaqī wasaʿīd (wretched and blessed)

muslimūna wa qāsiṭūn (believers and disbelievers/deviators)

Emphatic noun-adjective / adjective-adjective cognate collocations

ʾadbun furāt (palatable and sweet)

ash-shaiṭan ar-rajīm (the outcast Satan/Satan the outcast)

Adjective + adjective

ʿāmilatun nāṣibah (labouring, toil-worn)

khāfiḍatun rāfiʿa (abasing, exalting)

Adjective + preposition collocations

mustakhafun billīl wasāribun binnhāri (hiding at night and walking out in the day)

aṣ-ṣābir fī (patient in)

Prepositional collocations

wafī as-samāʾi rizqukum (in heaven is your provision)

fī sabīli Allahi (in the cause of God)

Circumstantial/adverbial collocations → adverb + adverb

isrāfan wa-bidāran (wastefully and hastily)

qawlan wa-fiʿlan (in words and in deeds)

4.7.1 Collocational clusters in the Quran

Ghazalah (2014, 311) maintains that collocations can appear in sets and clusters at the textual level and can be described as either synonymous sequences or consecutive combinations. These are collocations that are well-established in Islamic texts, and in Arabic more generally. Ghazalah illustrates this with some examples of synonymous collocations from the Quran:

> *ʾidhā s-samāʾu nfaṭarat, wa-ʾidhā l-kawākibu ntatharat, wa-ʾidhā l-biḥāru fujjirat, wa-ʾidhā l-qubūru buʿthirat* (82: 1-4)
>
> When the sky is cleft asunder. And when the stars are scattered. And when the seas burst forth. And when the graves are hurled about. (Ghazalah, 2014)
>
> *ʿidhā rujjati al-ʿarḍu rajjan, wa bussati al-jibālu bassan,fakānat habāʾan munbathan* (56: 4-6)
>
> When the earth shall be shaken with a severe shaking. And the mountains shall be crumbled to powder. And become as scattered dust. (Ghazala, 2014)

Ghazala (2014) asserts that the sense conveyed by these serial collocations is that of 'ruin and devastation', with each collocation using different imagery to convey a picture of destruction: the sky is 'cleft asunder'; stars are 'scattered'; the seas flood the land; and graves are 'hurled about'. Ghazala concedes that many Islamic collocations cannot be translated into equivalent standard English collocations, but he believes the translator should try to find an English equivalent with an identical grammatical form whenever possible. These collocations, for

example, can be broken down, and the translator can approximate the meaning of each section using an acceptable target-language equivalent. However, there should not be any interference with the Arabic language and the English translation should sound English – one short Islamic collocation can sometimes be translated into a full sentence in English.

In short, Ghazala (2014) extracts and categorises a large number of grammatical and lexical collocations from the Quran and supplies their English equivalents. If these collocations are compared with Arabic and English collocations, it can be seen that their grammatical patterns are unique to the Quran. Ghazala, however, does not elaborate on the category of culturally specific collocations in the Quran, which possess allegorical and metaphorical meanings that pose severe challenges for translators. Like other Arab and English scholars, he concentrates on collocations that can be recognised from their literal translation, and fails to pay attention to the restricted collocations found in the Quran. For example, he presents the noun + noun patterning, '*al-jibāla awtāda*', and its English equivalent, 'the mountains are stakes', rendering the phrase literally, but there are other grammatical collocational patterns that include deeper meanings embedded within them, such as the noun + noun culturally specific collocation '*jibti wat-ṭāghūt*'. These words are neologisms in the English language and therefore the translator needs to explain that '*jibit'* means 'magic', 'disbelief', 'idols', or anything that is worshipped other than Allah, whereas '*ṭāghūt*' means Satan or any thing that rebels a gainst the divine will. The present research addresses this omission by including an analytical discussion of this new type of Quranic collocation – the culturally specific collocation that possesses a deeper meaning – as well as introducing its various syntactic configurations. One of the reasons for this lies in the fact that this study is also intended as a practical guide for future translators to help them tackle the difficulties that arise when translating this type of Quranic collocation.

4.7.2 Culturally specific Quranic collocations and their translation

As mentioned above, culturally specific collocations in the Quran pose challenges for translators who may struggle to understand their implicit meaning. Such collocations may include allegorical meanings that require translators to understand the context rather than attempting a word-for-word translation. Newmark (1995, 95) has established a framework for categorising culturally specific items. His first category covers ecology (including flora, fauna and natural phenomena); in the second, he places material culture (including food, clothing, houses, towns and transportation); the third category focuses on social and cultural

subjects (such as work and leisure); the fourth on organisation, customs, activities, procedures and concepts, whether of a political, administrative, religious or artistic nature; and the final category relates to socio-cultural norms, including gestures and habits.

Abdul-Raof (2001, 146) comments that Quranic discourse includes some culturally specific ecological terminology that may sound unnatural to target-language readers, especially those from colder climates, and these items need to be elucidated in footnotes. He provides the following example of Surah 24: 39:

> *wa-lladhīna kafarū ʾaʿmāluhum ka-sarābin bi-qīʿatin yaḥsabuhu ẓ-ẓamʾānu māʾan ḥattā ʾidhā jāʾahu lam yajidhu shayʾan wa-wajada llāha ʿindahu fa-waffāhu ḥisābahu wa-llāhu sarīʿu l-ḥisāb*
>
> But the unbelievers, their deeds are like a mirage in a sandy desert, which the man parched with thirst mistakes for water; until when he comes up to it, he finds it to be nothing. (Ali: 1983)

According to Abdul-Raof (2001), Ali provides further information on the ecological word '*sarāb*' (mirage), used in this example, in a footnote:

> The mirage is a strange phenomenon of illusion. It is a trick of our vision. In the language of our parable, it rejects the Light which shows us the Truth, and deceives us with Falsehood. A lonely traveller in a desert, nearly dying of thirst, sees a broad sheet of water. He goes in that direction, lured on and on, but finds nothing at all. He dies in protracted agony. (Ali: 1983, 910, cited in Abdul-Raof, 2001)

This explanation of the word '*sarāb*' renders the target text more accessible and intelligible, whereas a literal translation would not convey the concept of a mirage. According to Mohammed Farghal and Mohammed Al-Masri (2000, 29), '[i]n the Holy Quran, translators will frequently be obliged to resort to interpretations because of the nature of the text'. Karamanian (2003), cited in Salar Anari and Abolfazl Sanjarani (2016, 145), also states that 'translation, involving the transposition of thoughts expressed in one language by one social group into the appropriate expression of another group, entails a process of cultural de-coding, re-coding and en-coding'. Thus, the translator needs to be familiar with the cultural allusions found in both the source language and the target language, and be prepared to use different strategies to convey the meaning appropriately to their readership.

Farghal and Al-Masri (2000, 29) state that '[t]he verses of the Holy [Quran] are woven in intricate and sharp ways. In addition, the presence of culture-specific terms and images augments problems.' This may be attributed to the fact that collocations in the Quran can appear idiosyncratic, in terms of their intended meaning and language. These culturally specific collocations lack equivalents in the target language, and translators may not be aware of the specific meaning of such a collocation in the particular context of the Quran, causing them to distort the meaning by using a literal translation, as for example, in verses 8 and 9 of Surah 101:

> *wa-ʾammā man khaffat mawāzīnuhu, fa-ʾummuhu hāwiya*
>
> But as for him whose scales are light, a bereft and hungry one will be his mother. (Pickthall, 1930: 2014)

Here, Allah describes what will happen on the Final Day when those whose evil deeds outweigh their good ones will be punished in the pit of hellfire. Although this collocation reads literally in Arabic as 'his mother will be in the bottom of the hellfire', a metaphorical sense also exists in this context. According to the books of exegesis by Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 468), Al-Tabari (1997, 7: 684), Al-Qurtubi (2006, 22: 446), and Al-Razi (1995, 16:75) the collocation means that the 'head' of the sinner will be the first part to be cast into hell's pit, and that 'his mother' meant the place where he lives, in that the boy resorts to his mother. Al-Razi asserts that the word mother in this verse being used as a simile. Pickthall (1930:1938) renders the term 'mother' literally and may possibly have misunderstood the meaning of '*hāwiya*' ('pit of hellfire') as he translates this phrase as his mother being 'bereft and hungry'. This translation is confusing to English readers, who may wonder why the sinner's mother should be punished.

Islamic religious items also have culturally specific meanings, and a literal translation would probably not transfer the message completely and could cause confusion, as in the Quranic collocation pattern of verb + noun + noun in the phrase '*wa-ʾatimmu l-ḥajja wa-l-ʿumrata li-llāhi*' (2: 196). This was translated by Pickthall (1930: 1938) as 'perform the pilgrimage and the visit (to Makka) for Allah'. However, Pickthall's translation of the word '*umrah*' as 'the visit (to Makka)' does not fully convey the meaning of this concept and the target reader would not be able to grasp its contextual meaning. In this case, the translator needs to use a free translation and a footnote strategy to explain this collocation and may also

need to clarify the difference between the concept of '*ḥajj*' and that of '*umrah*'. Free translation being faitful to the original meaning and not focus on the source language word order. More importantly, it uses different strategies that illuminate the implicit meaning to the audience, such as paraphrase, footnote, explanatory note, addition, and functional and descriptive equivalence.

Furthermore, some lexical items in culturally specific collocations in the Quran tend to have different denotative names depending on the words with which they collocate. In the Quran, the word 'people' collocates with 'book', as in 'people of the book' in Surah 3: 199, and with 'Al-Madīnah' ('people of Al-Madīnah') in Surah 9: 101; it also collocates with 'house' ('people of the house') in Surahs 11: 73 and 33: 33. In these three collocations, the term 'people' denotes different groups. In the first example, 'people of the book' refers to Jews and Christians, while 'people of Al-Madīnah' refers to those from the Prophet Mohammed's city, and 'people of the house' means those who have kinship with the Prophet Mohammed. However, the same collocation can be found in the Quran with a different function, meaning the family of the prophet Ibrahim, as in Surah Al-Aḥzāb. Therefore, translators of the Quran must be able to recognise the different meanings that words can possess depending on how they are used in collocations. According to Larson (1984, 101), 'a person who knows a language very well usually knows immediately by the other words which occur in the phrase or sentence which sense of the word is being signalled'.

4.8 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the concept of collocation as a linguistic phenomenon in both English and Arabic, considering the meaning of collocations and addressing the subject of collocational restrictions and clashes. It has also discussed a range of linguistic collocational theories relating to both languages and, in so doing, has exposed a gap in the research, revealing that – to date – no comparative theoretical study has yet focused on restricted collocations in English and Arabic. It has further examined collocational typologies in both languages, clarifying their similarities and differences, as well as the categorisation of collocations in the Quran, and this has similarly revealed that collocations have only been classified from a lexical and grammatical perspective, not a semantic one – an omission this research intends to remedy. Finally, the chapter has concluded that collocations, particularly in the Quran, can pose significant difficulties for translators who attempt to render their implicit meaning into another language using a literal translation technique, an approach that

focuses on word-for-word translation, as this can produce an ambiguous translation that potentially leaves target readers confused; a free translation is a more suitable approach to adopt when rendering the metaphorical and culturally specific collocations in the Quran into another language such as English. This approach tends to translate the spirit and the message and can provide target readers with contextual knowledge and enable them to grasp the intended meaning embedded in the collocations. Free translation is an interpretation of the meaning of the source text by the translator and to be conveyed into the target language with different grammatical structures. This approach may allow the translator to use different techniques to clarify the meaning to the target audience. Paraphrase technique, for example, can be used to add more information and when much further information needed footnote can be adopted in this case. Other techniques can be used as well such as explanatory note, shifting, functional and descriptive equivalence. The translator is at liberty to use any strategy with free translation based on how much information is needed.

Chapter Five

A Critical Assessment of Selected Translations of the Quran

5.1 Introduction

The Quran has been translated into most of the major languages of the world, with the English language being the most important of these. This chapter begins by giving a brief historical outline of the translation of the Quran into English, and is divided into two sections, the first of which discusses English translations of the Quran by non-Muslims, and the second, English translations by Muslims. This is followed by short biographies of the Quranic translators who have been selected for the study's comparative analysis: Pickthall, Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan. The final section focuses on critical assessments of their translations, analysing the comments of some of the scholars who have critiqued these translators' different approaches and the methods they employed.

5.2 A brief history of English translations of the Quran

This section focuses on a brief history of almost all of the English translations of the Quran by non-Muslims and a number of translations by Muslim translators.

5.2.1 English translations of the Quran by non-Muslims

Daoud Nassimi (2008) and Yasir Gadhi (1999) declare that the first English translation of the Quran appeared in the seventeenth century. Alexander Ross published the first edition of his work, *The Alcoran of Mahomet*, in 1649 in London, and Nassimi and Gadhi agree that it was the only English translation of the Quran produced in that century. Both authors, however, comment on the fact that Ross did not translate the Quran directly from its original Arabic but relied heavily on a French translation by André du Ryer, and as a result, his work includes many linguistic mistakes, mainly because it appears that he did not have sufficient knowledge of either Arabic or French. Furthermore, he also includes a large number of remarks in his introduction, text and appendix which appeare unacceptable to Muslims.

The first English version of the Quran translated directly from the Arabic was produced by George Sale in 1734, and was entitled *The Koran*, although it was more commonly known as the *Alkoran of Mohammed* (Daoud Nassimi, 2008; Abdur Raheem Kidwai, 1987). Sale was a lawyer who learnt Arabic at a royal court and also spent time as an

interpreter. In spite of the fact that this translation has been extremely popular, it has been criticised for its frequent omissions, as well as the fact that its translation of some of the verses distort their meaning. Nassimi (2008, 50) gives the example of Sale's translation of the Quranic phrase, '*yā-ʾayyuhā n-nāsu*' (4:1) ('Oh mankind') as 'Oh People of Mecca'.

Turning to the nineteenth century, J. M. Rodwell's English translation of the Quran, also entitled *The Koran*, was published in 1861 (Al-Jabari, 2008; Nassimi, 2008; Qadhi, 1999). The work had a major impact on the English language because Rodwell was the first translator to attempt – to some extent – to imitate the style of the Arabic text. However, he was criticised for changing the original order of the surahs, trying to put them in chronological order instead. In addition, in his introduction, Rodwell refers to the Prophet Mohammed as the 'crafty author of the Quran', and he inserts a number of comments which appeare unacceptable to Muslims. It also appears that his translation deformed the meaning of parts of the Quran.

Kidawi (1987), Qadhi (1999) and Nassimi (2008) observe that another English translation of the Quran appeared in 1880. Entitled *The Koran Translated*, it was produced by E. H. Palmer and published by Oxford University Press. However, it has attracted serious criticism, with claims that Palmer's version of the Quran includes sixty-five instances of omissions and mistranslations.

A little more than fifty years later, Richard Bell published his English translation of the Quran, entitled *The Quran Translated with a Critical Rearrangement of Surahs,* in London in 1937 (Qadhi, 1999, 359; Al-Jabari, 2008, 35; Kidwai, 1987, 10; Nassimi, 2008, 54). Al-Jabari (2008) states that Bell was an expert in Arabic at the University of Edinburgh, and his translation of the Quran contained special reference to the order of the surahs. However, Qadhi (1999) and Kidwai (1987) criticise Bell's translation for its difficult text and the fact that he describes the Prophet Mohammed as the 'author' of the Quran, apparently believing that the Quran was written by Mohammed himself rather than revealed to him by Allah. By contrast, Nassimi (2008) and Qadhi (1999) confirm that A. T. Arberry's English translation of the Quran, entitled *The Koran Interpreted,* published in London in 1955, is considered to be one of the best translations of the Quran into English. His translation possesses a highly syntactic quality, and he criticised other non-Muslim Quranic translators for their unsuccessful and unfaithful renditions which distorted the meaning of the verses. Nevertheless, Nassimi and Qadhi also criticise Arberry's translation, claiming that it cannot

be easily used as a reference work due to the way it combines several verses together in one paragraph without referring to their individual numbers. They also claim that his translation sometimes distorts the meaning of the verses: Nassimi (2008, 55) gives the example of Surah Al-Rūm (The Romans), which Arberry translates as 'the Greeks'. However, it can also be argued that Al-Rūm (as the Arabic rendering of Rome) refers to the Byzantines who were Greek-speaking, and Arberry should have clarified this term in more practical sense.

According to Qadhi (1999, 359) and Kidawi (1987, 11), N. J. Dawood, who rendered the Quran into English in an edition entitled *The Koran* (1956), was the only Jewish scholar to produce a translation of the Quran, and it became one of the most widespread of all non-Muslim English translations. These authors, however, assert that Dawood produced a biased translation: for example, he renders '*banī ādam*' as 'children of Allah' instead of 'children of Adam'. He also displays some sentiments in his introduction which are opposed by Muslims, and distorts the meaning of parts of the Quran. In addition, his translation uses a different chapter order to that of the original text.

5.2.2 English translations of the Quran by Muslims

Nassimi (2008), Qadhi (1999) and Kidwai (1987) inform us that the first Muslim to translate the Quran into English was Mohamed Abdul Hakim Khan. Published under the title, *The Holy Quran Translated with Short Notes*, in India in 1905, his work includes short exegetic commentaries. They assert that although Khan appears to have possessed substantial Quranic knowledge, as seen in the number of books he produced on the meaning of the sacred text, he admitted that he was unable to present the full complexity of the Quran to his English-language readers due to the difficulties he experienced in conveying the deeper meaning embedded in its language and in interpreting its inimitable style. Nassimi, Qudhi and Kidwai all make the point that Khan's translation is simple and clear, but they add that he not only relied entirely on literal translation but also failed to include the Arabic text in his work.

Nassimi (2008) and Qadhi (1999) also draw attention to Miza Dehlawi's English translation of the Quran, published in Delhi in 1921 and entitled *The Koran*, and Mizra Abul Fadl's translation, *The Quran Translated into English from the Original Arabic*, which was published in Allahabad, India, in the same year. Nassimi comments that Dehlawi was a scholar of Islam, who rendered the Quran into Urdu before translating it into English, and observes that his language and style are straightforward and clear. One of the shortcomings of

this version, however, is that it includes neither the Arabic text nor commentaries on the text, and it also fails to include the numbers of the individual parts (*juzu'*) of each verse. Nassimi also criticises the way that Abul Fadle tries to place the surahs in chronological order. Nevertheless, Abul Fadle's publication includes the Arabic text and a few notes which refer to some of the sources he used to disprove the anti-Muslim comments found in previous translations of the Quran by non-Muslim translators.

Another Muslim translator of the Quran, Muhammed Ali, published *The Holy Quran* in English in Lahore in 1917. This translation is known as the 'Ahmadi/Qadiani translation' (Nassimi, 2008; Qadhi, 1999) – Nassimi explains that the Ahmadiyyas (or Qadianias) do not believe that the Prophet Mohammed was Allah's final messenger, claiming instead Ghulam Ahmed as their prophet. Nassimi (2008, 52) describes Ali's translation as containing notes and a long introduction that he believes are redundant, and he refers to Kidwai's (1987) review of the work that claims Ali distorted the Quranic verses relating to Mohammed and Jesus. Ali also refused to acknowledge some of the miracles recorded in the Quran and, because of this, he mistranslates some important verses: for example, he renders Surah 2: 6, which describes Allah's command to Moses to strike a rock with his staff, whereupon twelve springs of water sprang up, as 'march on the rock with your staff', which gives little sense of the verse's original meaning.

Nassimi (2008) and Qadhi (1999) also review Ghulam Sarwar's translation of the Quran into English, published in Singapore and Britain in 1929 under the title of *The Holy Quran*. It includes some essays on Islam and the life of the Prophet Mohammed, and the introduction presents a critique of the English translations of Sale, Rodwell, Palmer and Muhammed Ali, although it fails to include the original Arabic text. Moreover, this translation, like Ali's, is considered to be an Ahmadi/Qadiani work, and it seems that Sarwar took the same overall approach as Ali.

Nassimi (2008), Al-Jabari (2008) and Mohammed Kaleel (2005) also assess Mohamed Asad's 1964 English translation of the Quran, *The Message of the Quran*, published by the Islamic Centre in Geneva. The first edition, however, is an incomplete translation, comprising only the first nine surahs; in 1980, he completed the English translation of the whole of the Quran, which was published by the Dar al-Andalus Limited Library in Gibraltar. Al-Jabari (2008, 31) claims that Asad's translation deviates from the original meaning of some of the verses: for example, he refused to translate some of the

miracles recorded in the text in a literal fashion, particulary such scenes as Abraham being thrown into the fire or Jesus speaking from the cradle. However, both Nassimi and Khaleel observe that Asad's translation is one of the most widely used English translations of the Quran due to the fact that is highly readable and contains some useful commentaries and notes.

Al-Jabary (2008), Saleh Al-Ghamdi (2015), Andrew Rippin (2004) and Muhammad Shah (2010) note that Muhammed Abdel-Haleem, whose work, *The Quran: A New Translation*, was published by Oxford University Press in 2004, has produced one of the more comprehensive of the recent translations into English by an Arab Muslim. The work contains a short biography of the life of the Prophet Mohammed, a history of the Quran, and a bibliography, chronological chart, map and index, as well as including notes that elucidate the Quran's historical and geographical context, and offer some evocative background information. Abdel-Haleem, an Egyptian-British scholar, has a special interest in Arabic-English lexicography and Quranic studies, producing many works in this field. The above authors commend him for the fact that he not only focuses on the inherent difficulties of understanding the Quranic structure and style but also uses contemporary language, making it easier for non-Arabic-speaking readers to relate to the text. His translation is, they believe, an accurate rendition of the Quran. Shah (2010) and Nassimi (2008), however, also highlight some of the work's shortcomings. The former asserts that the title of Abdel-Haleems' work, which includes the word 'new', makes little sense, given the rapidly changing nature of language, while the latter criticises it for omitting the Arabic text and translating the word 'Allah' as 'God'.

5.3 Overview of the selected translators

This study has selected three translations – out of the many English translations of the Quran available – for further analysis. Before turning to these, however, it is useful to understand the background of the translators and their qualifications as Arabic translators of the sacred text.

5.3.1 Muhammed M. Pickthall (1875-1936)

The first of these translations was completed by Muhammed Pickthall in 1930. Pickthall was born in 1875 in Suffolk. On the death of his father, when he was six, the family moved to

London, and when he turned seventeen, he travelled to Egypt and Jerusalem, seeking a consular job in Palestine. While in Damascus, he developed an interest in Islam, and on his return, he converted and changed his name from William to Muhammed (Sadiq, 2010). When the Balkan Wars broke out in 1912, Pickthall welcomed the Young Turks' revolution and embarked upon a journalistic crusade on Turkey's behalf, which led to a four-month sojourn in Istanbul in 1913, during which time, he publicly called for a separate peace with Turkey. Humayun Ansari (2017) confirms that, as well as becoming increasingly engaged with issues regarding the fate of the Ottoman caliphate, Pickthall also formed a strong relationship with members of the South Asian Muslim community living in Britain. Ansari notes that, despite the fact that Pickthall did not announce his conversion to Islam until November 1917, he had been working intensively with Khawaja Kamel-ud-Din (1870-1932), the Imam of the Shah Jahan Mosque in Woking, and with other South Asian Muslims connected to the Woking Muslim Mission, ever since the outbreak of the First World War.

In 1920, Pickthall was invited to India by the leaders of the Khilafat movement (which was dedicated to preserving the authority of the Ottoman sultan as the caliph of Islam after the First World War) to edit the *Bombay Chronicle*. Once there, he collaborated with Gandhi and addressed large gatherings of Muslims and Hindus, who were united in agitating against British colonial rule. Pickthall resigned when the newspaper lost a government-instigated court case and was forced to pay crippling fines. However, he soon received another offer to become editor of the journal, *Islamic Culture*, in the state of Hyderabad, which was ruled by a Muslim *nizam* (monarch). It was during this time that he translated the Quran into English (Geoffrey Nash, 2017). Pickthall began his translation in 1928, and it was to take him two years (Sadiq, 2010). During this time, he consulted many European scholars, as well as travelling to Egypt in 1929 to obtain approval for his work from scholars at the Al-Azhar University, where he gained the support of Rasheed Rida (1865-1935), a Syro-Egyptian Muslim reformer. Pickthall's English translation was published by Knopf in New York in 1930 under the title, *The Meaning of the Glorious Koran* (Nash, 2017). The work was reprinted in many different countries: in 1938, the central press in Hyderabad published an edition with Arabic and English text and, in 1970, a Delhi-based publisher produced a trilingual version of Pickthall's translation containing Arabic, Urdu and English (Peter Clark, 2017).

5.3.2 Abdullah Y. Ali (1872-1953)

The second English-language translation of the Quran selected for analysis is that of Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1934). Ali was born in 1872 in Surat, a textile town in Gujarat, western India (M. A Sherif, 1994), into a family belonging to the Dawoodi Bohra sect, one of the Shi'ah Ismaili branches of Islam (Abdullah Al-Khatib, 2010). He began studying the Quran and the Arabic language at the age of five, and was later sent to the Bombay Anjuman Islam School, one of the most prominent educational establishments in India, which was distinguished by the fact that it was open to students from different Islamic sects. Ali studied there for a short time before moving, in 1882, to the Welson English School, founded John Welson, a minister of the free Scottish church. Ali spent five years at the school before moving to Welson College, part of the University of Bombay, where he graduated in classical literature in 1891. He obtained a scholarship to pursue legal studies at St John's College, Cambridge, and graduated with a higher degree in 1895 (Al-Khatib, 2010). Ali returned to India, where he worked for the British government in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, as well as for the Indian Civil Service, and was appointed as assistant tax adjudicator in Saharanpur at the young age of twenty-three. He later moved to the Eastern Britain Muhammads College in Bareilly, in Uttar Pradesh, where he worked with James Meston, who was finance minister, before being appointed governor, of Agra and Oudh. In 1900, Ali returned once more to Britain, where he lectured on colonial politics and relations between the British and the Muslims in India. The six lectures he delivered at the Institute of Basmor Edwards were published in 1907 as a book entitled *The Life and Labour of the People of India*. He used the lectures to call for Indian politics to be freed from religious differences, and to state his belief that the Muslim minority would only be able to play a more significant role in the government of India if their education was secular rather than religious.

Ali always exhibited a strong sense of loyalty towards the British state and, as a result, he was among those chosen to represent the country in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, and was later selected as the British government's Indian representative at the League of Nations in 1928. His long and varied experience gave him a solid background in research and an understanding of how to express himself in a style of English that could be easily understood by Western non-Arabic speakers, which stood him in good stead when he came to translate the Quran into English in 1934. Ali's publication appeared under the title *The Holy Quran: An Interpretation in English* (Al-Khatib, 2010). As Iqbal states:

> [T]he political upheavals of [Abdullah] Yusuf Ali's times, his peculiar understanding of the role of the British system in Indian politics, his affinity with the English Romantic poets and his relationship with the Raj had a significant impact on the choice of diction and vocabulary employed in his translation. (Muzaffar Iqbal, 2000, 107)

Ali died in 1953, aged eighty-one, in a London hospital. His tragic personal life (his first and second marriages ended in failure) was mitigated to a certain extent by the success of his translation of the Quran. It is in this context, however, that Al-Khatib (2010) refers to Ali's introduction to his work, in which he speaks of human life as being continually exposed to moral storms, whose sadness and distress cause more destruction than that caused by the real storms of the natural world, making life seem worthless at times. Nevertheless, Ali's translation of the Quran still remains one of the most popular in the English-speaking world, and it has been reprinted numerous times in many different countries, including India, the US, Britain, Saudi Arabia and Lebanon.

5.3.3 Taqiuddin Al-Hilali (1893-1987) and Muhammed Khan (1927)

The third translation selected for discussion is that of Taqiuddin Al-Hilali and Muhsin Khan (1974). According to Jassem (2014), Al-Hilali and Khan produced their translation of the Quran whilst lecturing at the Islamic University of Madinah. The first edition comes in a short one-volume work, *Interpretation of the Meanings of the Noble Quran in the English language*, published in Istanbul. This was later expanded as a second edition consisting of nine volumes, published by the King Fahd Complex for Printing the Quran under the title, *The Noble Quran: English Translation of the Meanings and Commentary*. Both translators shared a great interest in the language of the Quran and in the Quranic exegetic tradition (Nassimi, 2008).

Al-Hilali was born in 1891 in a village called al-Fidah in Morocco. By the time he was twelve, he had memorised the whole of the Quran. He later studied Arabic, the hadiths and the *tajwaid* (the rules of Quranic recitation) (Al-Jabari, 2008; Nassimi, 2008), completing his graduate studies in Egypt (Kidwai, 2007). Al-Khaleel (2005) relates that Al-Hilali then gained a doctorate at the University of Berlin, before travelling and living in Iraq, India and Egypt, pursuing his religious education (Nassimi, 2008).

Khan, meanwhile, was born in 1925 in Al-Qaur, a city in the Punjab in Pakistan (Fahad Al-Malik, 1995). Khan was of Afghani origin: his grandfather had fled the wars and

tribal conflicts in Afghanistan (Nassimi, 2008). He gained a degree in medicine and surgery from the University of the Punjab in Lahore, and later a postgraduate diploma in respiratory medicine from the University of Wales (Kidwai, 2007). He then travelled to Saudi Arabia, where he worked as a hospital director for the ministry of health for fifteen years in Al-Ta'if and Medina, during the reign of King Abdul-Aziz (1900-1953). Elimam (2009) and Zaidan Jassem (2014) add the comment that Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation of the Quran has been reprinted many times by different publishers in many different countries.

There are three main reasons for selecting these three translations by the authors whose lives and work are summarised above. Firstly, they are the translations most commonly used by both academics and non-academics as they are readily available in university libraries, mosques and online (Kidwai, 2007, 2017; Al-Khatib, 2010). Its popularity and the range of its distribution means that the work of Al-Hilali and Khan (1974), in particular, is the one of the most widespread of all Quranic translations in the English-speaking world, partly due to the fact that copies of it are printed and distributed free by the Saudi government (Khaleel, 2005). Secondly, the translators all come from different backgrounds: for instance, Pickthall is a native English speaker, whereas Al-Hilali is a native Arabic speaker, and Khan learnt Urdu and English and then Arabic, while Ali is of Indian origin and, similar to Khan, first learnt Urdu and English before mastering the Arabic language. An understanding of the authors' varied backgrounds can help in identifying whether the original language (and cultural context) of the translator has an effect on their work. Thirdly, the translations by Ali and Pickthall were first published in the first half of the twentieth century, and they used the somewhat archaic English of the time, while the first translation of Al-Hilali and Khan was completed in the second half of the twentieth century, by which time modern English had become standard and translation studies was already establishing itself as an academic discipline. This can explain some of the differences between the translations, particularly since there is a time span of around forty years between the versions.

5.4 Critical assessment of the selected translations

5.4.1 A critical assessment of Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation

Khaleel (2005), Al-Jabari (2009) and Al-Ghamdi (2015) criticise the way Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation (1974) rely on the commentaries of medieval exegetes, such as Al-Tabari,

Al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir, and the fact that their version adopts a traditional source-oriented approach, leading to a redundancy of additions, as well using an excessive transliteration procedure which renders the translation problematic. Khaleel (2005) claims that Saudi Arabia attempted to impose these commentaries for political purposes. As an example of this, he cites Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation of the verse (5:21) that reports Moses' address to the Israelites ('O my people! Enter the Holy Land that God has assigned unto you'). Khaleel (2005, 3) claims that the Saudi government transformed the meaning of this verse into a modern political text by translating it as 'O my people! Enter the Holy Land (Palestine)'. It could be argued, however, that this is a controversial claim, given the political tensions among Arab Muslims and Jews in the region, and therefore Kaleel is displaying his political ideology and personal opinion rather than the results of his close analysis of the text or its secondary sources.

Kidwai (2007), Elimam (2009) and Nassimi (2008) assess Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation approach, and the former comments that it contains 'useful notes culled from primary sources, elucidating a number of recurring Quranic terms and concepts, and inserting explanatory parenthetical phrases. Some minor mistakes accepted, it is a noteworthy translation' (Kidwai, 2007, cited in Eliman, 2009, 243). Meanwhile, Elimam (2009) and Nassimi (2008) stress that Al-Hilali's and Khan's version is unique in that it consists of 730 pages and presents the surahs separately. Moreover, it often uses parentheses to clarify and explain the meaning of the verses, and includes footnotes citing the sources mentioned (i.e. Al-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi, Ibn Kathir and Al-Bukhari). These authors add that the translation uses Arabic phrases such as '*ṣala Allahu ʿalīhi wa salam*' ('Peace be upon him'), referring to the Prophet Mohammed, and '*raḍiah Allahu ʿalīhi/ʿalīha/ʿalīhim'* ('May Allah [be] pleased with him/her/them'), referring to the Prophet's companions and some of the other characters whose stories and names are mentioned, thus keeping some words that are difficult to translate in the original Arabic, with an explanation of the phrase in parentheses.

More recently, Mohammad Hawamdeh and Kais Kadhim (2015) has conducted a study of Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation of the first eight verses of the surah called 'the Cave'. He argues that the cohesive explicitness of their translation clarifies the ambiguity of the Arabic in the Quranic text and narrows the gap between the Arabic and English. Nevertheless, the use of these techniques can tend towards over-translation, meaning that the target reader receives too much information, which may prove a hindrance to their understanding of the text. As such, Hawamdeh and Kadhim believe that it is often better to

adopt a translation approach that limits the use of information and explanatory text contained in parentheses. He indicates two instances of parenthetical cohesive explicitness that occur in Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation which could potentially confuse the reader:

> *al-ḥamdu li-llāhi lladhī ʾanzala ʿalā ʿabdihi l-kitāba wa-lam yajʿal lahū ʿiwajā* (18: 1)
>
> All praise and thanks be to Allah, who has sent down to His slave (Muhammed) the Book (the Quran), and has not placed therein any crookedness. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996, 164, cited in Hawamdeh and Kadhim 2015, 164)

Hawamdeh and Kadhim argues that the addition of 'Muhammed' in parentheses is based upon a lexical reiterative relationship between the source-language/target-language units: the former entails 'His slave' and the latter is a referential nominal subordinate – 'Muhammed' – which can replace the former. The author also notes that the word 'Quran' in the target language is a referential nominal subordinate which can replace 'the book' in the source language. Consequently, both the brackets and the word 'thanks' may create cohesive explicitness but are possibly confusing to a non-Arabic-speaking reader. He considers that a more appropriate translation would be:

> All praises be to Allah, who has sent down the Quran to Muhammed, and has not placed therein any crookedness. (Hawamdeh and Kadhim, 2015, 164)

It could be argued, however, that the structure of Hawamdeh and Kadhim's translation is inauthentic and may mean that it deviates from the original meaning of the Quranic verse. That is, the target reader may understand the sentence, 'and has not placed therein any crookedness', as referring to the Prophet Mohammed or to Allah rather than the Quran, as it directly follows the name of Mohammed. Thus, the translation by Al-Hilali and Khan appears the more informative as it conveys both the implicit meaning and the original terminology of the Quran: it not only displays the the purpose for selecting this specific form of vocabulary and sentence structure but allows the target reader to recognise that Mohammed is also a slave of Allah, like other people, and the Quran is a book that came directly from Allah and was revealed to, but not written by, Mohammed. Al-Hilali's and Khan's free translation, elucidated by the text in parentheses, provides target readers with a broader contextual knowledge, enabling them to grasp the intended meaning of the source language.

As Newmark (1995) notes, it is essential that a translator uses the paraphrase technique if the text includes important implications and omissions, contradicting Hawamdeh and Kadhim's (2015) claim that the use of paraphrases and footnotes may not be appropriate when rendering the Quran into English. Arguably, if the translator prefers to remain close to the style of original text of the Quran, then he or she would use a literal translation method which may not convey the intended meaning. The Quran, for example, refers to historical events without giving background information and its text includes numerous symbolic or pragmatic expressions that cannot be translated into English literally without further explanation; therefore important information of this kind needs to be added to clarify the meaning of the text for the intended readers. Generally speaking, literal translation should be used, if possible, when translating the Quran as this method maintains the original text, but a free translation approach can be used as needed in order to convey the intended message accurately to the target readers. The Quran includes agreat number of hidden meanings and free translation works better in this case as it focuses and reproduces the content and allows translators to use different strategies such as paraphrase, footnote, explanatory note, functional and descriptive equivalence to add important information to the target language. More importantly, the translator should use English linguistic structures when translating freely Arabic Quran into English, not employ or copy Arabic ones, as he or she is addressing readers who speak a language whose form differs completely from that of Arabic.

To conclude, Al-Hilali and Khan tend to focus more on transferring the meaning of the Quran and exposing their target readers to as much information as possible in order to guarantee that they understand the Quranic text. The translation technique they adopt may be attributed to the fact that the Quran includes specific terms and stories that need to be explained. Their use of this technique is supported by Richard Martin (1982, 363) who argues: 'Sacred speech […] presents generic symbolic figures – God, angels, prophets, believers, unbelievers – and the situations it narrates must be interpreted to mean something for someone in the particular contexts in which it is interpreted.' However, one of the shortcomings of their translation is that Al-Hilali and Khan (1996) do not refer in their introduction either to the method or the strategies they adopt in the translation, despite the fact that throughout the text they use intensive footnotes and parantheses as well as other translation techniques, such as borrowing and compensation. In these footnotes and commentaries, they also cite the narrations of the Prophet Mohammed as rendered in the hadiths of Al-Bukhari and Muslim, and sometimes refer to other books where more

information can be found. They mainly depend on the free translation method; however, on some occasions, they include repetition and a redundancy of explanation which may serve to confuse target readers

5.4.2 A critical assessment of Abdullah Ali's translation

Both Khaleel (2005) and Al-Khatib (2010) assess Ali's translation of the Quran (1934). Khaleel (2005) voices strong criticism of the work, claiming that Ali copied the exegetical materials from medieval texts. He argues, moreover, that his translation is anti-Semitic, noting that in 2002 the Los Angeles school district forbad the use of his footnoted commentary in local schools. However, apart from this example, Khaleel does not provide any evidence to support this assertion. Without a detailed discussion of the elements of anti-Semitism that Khaleel claims exist in the text or evidence that the translation is mainly based on medieval exegetic materials, these assertions appear weak. Meanwhile, Al-Khatib (2010) critique of Ali's translation of the Quran is focused on his adoption of semantic and literal approaches. Al-Khatib believes that the semantic approach ignores the target reader, who needs a more communicative translation to understand the message of the sacred text, while observing that Ali also adopts a literal translation technique at times, using footnotes to clarify the original text and a translation style that seems 'overly poetic' and 'romantic'. Al-Khatib maintains that although Ali mastered the English language, he does not appear as proficient in Arabic, which is shown by the fact that not only does he make numerous linguistic mistakes but his translation also contains a number of misunderstandings of *shariʿa* and Islamic doctrine. Al-Khatib notes in passing that although Ali studied Arabic while in England, he only gained an average grade in his Arabic exam.

Al-Khatib further maintains that Ali's work was affected by his career and his unhappy personal life, and this had a particular impact on his interpretation of the bliss of paradise as described in the Quran, prompting him to consider it in purely spiritual terms, excluding material objects or sexual desire. As such, Ali's views seem to be in contradiction with the Islamic creed. This could also be due to his lack of religious education, particularly since he did not study *sharīʿa* law. Al-Khatib (2010, 178) illustrates his criticism with the following example from Surah 44: 54: 'So; and We shall join them to Companions with beautiful, big, and lustrous eyes' (Ali: 1936). Al-Khatib (2010) notes that the Quranic text describes the bliss of paradise (for Muslim men) in terms of marrying the *ḥūr* (beautiful young women); however, Ali translates this verse as 'join them to' rather than 'marry', and

also translates the word *ḥūr* as 'companions' rather than 'wives'. More importantly, however, Ali comments that there are in fact no real people or objects – or any physical reality at all – in paradise. According to Al-Khatib, Ali also commits an error when translating Surah Az-Zukhruf as to 'have satisfaction', noting that he contravenes the rhetorical rules of Arabic which reject the use of metaphor and figurative language unless the literal meaning is unable to convey the intended message. In this verse, the correct meaning is 'eat' because it is collocated with fruit: 'Ye shall have therein abundance of fruit, from which ye shall have satisfaction' (Ali: 1936). Al-Khaṭīb states that when he looked at other translations – such as those by Pickthall, Al-Hilali and Khan, Arberry, Asad, and others – he found that all of them had translated the verb as 'eat', raising the question of why Ali chose to render it differently. Ali's mistaken translation, as Al-Khatib shows, may have arisen from the fact that he believed there to be no material life in paradise – no food, no sexual desire – but only a spiritual one, and this belief affected his translation of some parts of the Quran.

In the introduction to his work, *The Glorious Quran: Translation and Commentary* (1934: 1975, xii-xiii), Ali refers to the most important *tafsīrs* or exegeses that he uses and also mentions from time to time in his footnotes. He states that some of these commentaries expound views with which he disagrees, and he therefore adopts only their general sense. He used the work of Al-Tabari (839-923 CE), calling it a perfect mine of historical information; *The Kashshāf* by Zamakhshari (d. 1144); the *Tafsir Al-Kabīr* by Al-Razi (d. 1210), which he proclaimed to be very useful for its interpretation of the Quran from a Sufi or spiritual depictions; *Anwār-ut-Tanzīl* by Baidawi (d. 1286); and the *Tafsīr* of Ibn Kathir (1300-1373), which he believed was overly voluminous but carried great authority among the *ulama* (community of Islamic scholars). He also drew on *Itqān fīʿulūm il-Quran* by Al-Suyuti (d. 1506), as well as *Tafsīr Rahmānī* by Mahaimi (d. 1432). Ali mentions that he also depended on the modernist school in Egypt, using the unfinished commentary of Muhammad Abduh (d. 1905), which was completed by Muhammed Rashid Rida (1898-1935), the editor of the *Manār* newspaper as well as what he calls the 'jewels' contained in the work of Sheikh Tantawi, a student of Muhammad Abduh. Due to his reliance on these sources of interpretation, Ali uses extensive footnotes throughout his translation. However, these sometimes – if not mostly – fail to reflect the accurate meaning of the text.

5.4.3 A critical assessment of Pickthall's translation

Khaleel (2005) and Kidwai (2017) analyse Pickthall's translation of the Quran (1930), with the latter focusing on both its strengths and its weaknesses. Khaleel (2005) states that this translation was the one most commonly used in the first half of the twentieth century but it lost its popularity when the Saudi government started to distribute other translations free of charge. However, I would argue that the waning popularity of this translation may have been due less to the availability of free rival translations and more to the fact that the archaic language Pickthall uses reflects the historical period in which he was working, and as a consequence, the uninitiated reader could find it difficult to understand parts of his translation. In contrast, Kidwai (2017) claims that Pickthall's work has in fact retained its popularity to the present day, with more than 160 editions on record, published in many different parts of the world, including India, Pakistan, Kuwait, Iran, Malaysia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Lebanon, Britain and the US, with the kindle edition released on 23 July 2014.

Kidwai (2017) argues that Pickthall distinguished himself as an excellent translator on the basis of his successful rendering of the sense of the original Quranic text and the message it contains. Moreover, in 1919, Pickthall also published an article entitled 'The Quran', criticising previous translations, showing that he was well acquainted with Quranic scholarship, and particularly with the Orientalist critique of the sacred text. However, Kidwai maintains that one of the sources of weakness in Pickthall's work is the fact that he did not appear to engage with this scholarship when working on his translation in 1930, and this, Kidwai considers, represents a tremendous loss. This author also notes that in the introduction to his translation, Pickthall indicates that he has drawn on Al-Bukhari's collection of hadiths; however, there is little evidence that he used these to clarify the meaning of any of the Quranic verses, nor did he make any reference to these hadiths in the main body of his work.

Kidawi also maintains that Pickthall, at times, did not wholly succeed in conveying the meaning of some culturally specific concepts and some of the legal discourse in the Quran. For example, he did not add any explanatory notes to clarify that the rite of animal slaughter forms part of the tradition of Islamic pilgrimage. Furthermore, in his treatment of Surah An-Nisa, which deals with women's rights, Pickthall does not present any explanation, failing to show how the Quran established gender equality, giving Arab women entitlement to inheritance. A further shortcoming of his translation is that some of the footnotes are short

and inaccurate, omitting important information. For instance, in Surah Al-Qasas (28: 15), which proclaims that Moses was guilty of a crime when he killed a Copt (an Egyptian Christain) – 'So Moses struck him with his fist and killed him' – Pickthall's translation presents the prophet in a poor light. He should have clarified that Moses had unintentionally killed the Copt and that, as the Quran adds, he soon repented and Allah accepted his repentance.

Although Kidawi highlights some of the shortcomings of Pickthall's translation, he does not comment on the fact that Pickthall adopted a method of literal translation when rendering the Quran into English, with the result that he fails to acknowledge the figurative images in some of the verses, which would have benefited from footnotes and/or paraphrasing to convey their full meaning. Literal translation can only be used without explanation when needed. In his introduction to *The Glorious Quran: Text and Explanatory Translation* (1930: 1938), Pickthall does not make any reference to the most important hadith collections of Al-Bukhari and Muslim, neither does he cite any references in his comments or footnotes. In fact, he includes very few comments and notes in his translation and, for this reason, his literal translation does not succeed in conveying the allegorical meanings of some of the terms related to the religious, historical and cultural context of the Quran. This approach risks distorting the implicit meanings in the Quran and misleading the target reader. Indeed, Abdullah Ali (1975, xv) himself has criticised Pickthall for this omission, claiming that 'he has added very few notes to elucidate the text. His rendering is almost literally.' It also appears that Pickthall, like Ali, was not acquainted with either Islamic *sharīʿa*, or related hadiths in Al-Bukhari and Muslim and as a result, many of the verses relating to legal discourse and to essential background information have not been translated effectively, and knowledge of these materials is essential if a translator wishes to convey a full understanding of the Quranic text.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has offered a brief history of the translation of the Quran into English by both non-Muslims and Muslims, and through a critical assessment of several of these works has revealed the different approaches and methods that have been adopted by translators from the earliest to the most recent period of Quranic translation.The chapter has also drawn attention to how essential it is for the translator to possess a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, as well as the Quranic exegetical works, in order to translate the text appropriately

and avoid errors such as Arberry committed when he translated '*Al-Rūm*' as 'the Greeks' rather than 'the Romans'. It has also presented short biographies of the translators of the three English translations of the Quran selected for the comparative analysis – Pickthall, Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan – showing how their lives, education and historical circumstances affected their translations, and followed this with a discussion on the merits of the various critical assessments of their work. This discussion has provided an insight into the different approaches and methods these scholars adopted in their translation of the Quran, and it can be predicted that this will impact their rendering of the culturally specific collocations in the Quran into English, analysed in the next chapter. The current research draws attention to the pressing need to translate the meaning of the Quran into other languages for a number of reasons: firstly, to allow non-Arab Muslims to know and understand their religion; and secondly, to give non-Muslims, who do not know Arabic but have a strong desire to read and understand the Quran, the opportunity to fully comprehend its meaning.

The next chapter analyses the translations of selected collocations in the three works mentioned above.

Chapter Six
Comparative Semantic Analysis of Translations of Collocational Phrases in the Quran

6.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces a discussion on the issues that arise when translating the collocations contained in the Quran, and presents the results of a comparative semantic analysis of three English translations (Pickthall, 1938; Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996; and Ali, 1975) of a selection of culturally specific Quranic collocations. The study focuses on the strategies and procedures employed by these translators, exploring the drawbacks of using the method of literal translation when translating culturally specific collocations in the Quran in light of the proposition put forward by this thesis that using such an approach can deform the meaning of the source text and lead to a loss of its essential meaning. It tests the argument that the method of free translation, which focuses on content rather than form, is a more suitable approach when attempting to transfer the implicit meanings of such collocations into English.

6.2 Problematic issues in the translation of Quranic collocations

The problems that appear inherent to the translation of collocations in the Quranic text, as the previous chapters have revealed, can be further exacerbated by the fact that many combinations of words consist of unique linguistic and semantic features that are culturally specific. According to Dweik and Shakra:

> The difficult task of translating Arabic collocations into English is further aggravated when the translation of collocations deals with a religious text. Most of the problems encountered are due to the specificity of certain lexical items, which are rooted in the structure of the language and are deeply immersed in Arabic culture. (Dweik and Shakra 2011, 8)

Farghāl and Shannāq (1999, cited in Alsofi et al., 2014, 42) likewise stress that translators particularly encounter problems when attempting to translate the collocations that occur in religious texts because they entail meanings that are culturally specific and, as such, do not possess equivalents in the target language. Sughair (2007, cited in Alsofi et al., 2014, 42) observes that such collocations are often reproduced inappropriately and potentially mislead the target audience, due to the difficulties that translators face in recognising their distinct

linguistic, stylistic and cultural aspects, leading them to adopt a literal translation that distorts the intended meaning and causes confusion. Translating such culturally specific collocations may require free word combinations in the target language or additional explanation in order to transfer the approximate meaning informatively. Hence, the free translation approach is usually the most suitable for rendering these Quranic collocations into English. Abdul-Raof (2005, 172) rejects the literal translation of Quranic cultural items because this 'leads to cultural interference that distorts the message underpinning the Source Language text, thus impairing the volume of both [the] informati[veness] and intentionality of the source text'. He warns against using a literal method of translation to render lexical items that include culturally specific meanings from Arabic into another language, as this approach cannot transfer the contextual meanings of the source language, and results in the transmission of an uninformative or even distorted message to the readership. Alrosan (2000, cited in Al-Sofi et al, 2014, 41) emphasises this point, maintaining that 'the main complicated area in translating SL collocation is [the] translator's failure of selecting the convenient TL equivalent which may not be a collocation', and agrees that translators may not succeed in their task when they attempt to transfer a collocation into the target language by means of literal translation.

The following examples illustrate the difficulties translators find in grasping the connotative meanings of culturally specific collocations. For example, Pickthall renders the Quranic collocational pattern of noun + adjective in the collocation '*alʾāyat al-kubra*' (Surah 79: 20) literally by as 'a tremendous token', while Al-Hilali and Khan translate it as 'a great sign' and 'miracles'. This surah recounts how Allah commands Moses to go to the Pharaoh and show him 'great signs' to convince him that Moses is a prophet. According to the *tafsīr* of Ibn Kathir (1999, 4: 399), Al-Tabari (1997, 7: 523) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 22: 55), these signs were manifest when Moses threw his staff to the ground and it turned into a serpent, and when light streamed from his outstretched hand. However, Al-Razi (1995, 16: 42) reports disagreements among interpreters regarding the meaning of the surah: some believe that the 'great signs' refer to the hand of Moses, others state that they refer to his staff, and yet another group believe it includes both. Therefore, Pickthall's literal translation does not fully convey the collocation's intended meaning, and while Al-Hilali and Khan use a paraphrase, 'miracles', to clarify the term 'great signs', the meaning needs to be further explained and they should have included an explanatory note or footnote.

The second example of a Quranic collocational pattern (verb + noun) (passive voice) is the phrase '*abyaḍḍat ʿaynāh*' (literally, 'his eyes were whitened') in Surah 12: 84. Ibn

Khathir (1999, 2: 418) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 11: 431) interpret '*abyaḍḍat ʿaynāh*' as meaning that Jacob wept so much over his beloved sons, Joseph and Benjamin, he could no longer see (figuratively, he lost his sight). Meanwhile, Al-Razi (1995, 9: 196-97) maintains that '*abyaḍḍat ʿaynāh*' means 'his weeping increased', and according to DAEQU (2008, 658), 'his eyes were blind' (literally, 'white') or 'became flooded with tears' of grief. Pickthall renders this collocation literally as 'his eyes were whitened', while Al-Hilali and Khan translate it freely as 'he lost his eyes'. As the collocate 'white', as it is used in this instance in the Quran, moves from a normal to a specific meaning, Pickthall's literal translation is ambiguous and may obstruct the intended sense of the phrase.

Sadiq (2010, 83) has conducted a comparative semantic study of four English translations of Surah Ad-Dukhan (by Pickthall, Arberry, Ali and Ghali, respectively). In his analysis of the translations of the surah's second verse, Sadiq found that Ali, Arberry and Ghali translate the collocation '*a-l-kitābi l-mubīn*' as 'the manifest book', rendering the word '*al-kitāb*' literally as 'the book', while Pickthall translates it as 'scripture':

wal-kitābi l-mubīn (44:2)

By the Scripture that maketh plain (Pickthall, 1985)

Sadiq (2010) states that '*al-kitāb*' is a polysemic word that includes a wide range of meanings in the Quran, and according to Al-Asfahany (2002), it may refer to 'heavenly books', as in surahs 11: 17; 62: 17; 8: 75; 18: 45; and 3: 119. Sadiq (2010) notes that the exegeses of An-Nasafy (1982, 3: 126), Ash-Sharawy (1999), Al-Baydawy (1999, 2: 380) and Ashur (2003, 16: 3951), as well as The Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs (SCIA) (1995, 733) and the King Fahd Complex for Printing the Holy Quran (KFCPHQ) (2004, 1248), all interpret '*al-kitāb*' in this collocation ('the manifest book') as 'the Quran'. However, Ali, Arberry and Ghali translate it literally as 'the book' and should have added an explanatory footnote or a paraphrase clarifying that it alludes to the Quran, while Pickthall's translation is inappropriate as it deviates from the original meaning by using the word 'scripture', which could refer to the Bible rather than the Quran. The problem that occurs when translating Quranic collocations is therefore due to their metaphorical sense and culturally specific meanings. For this reason, translators need to pay attention to the context rather than focusing on word-for-word translation. As Sadiq (2010) illustrates, in the Quran the word 'book' collocates with other nouns and adjectives: for example, it is also collocated with the noun 'people' as in 'people of the book', meaning in this case 'people of scripture', and can refer to either

Muslims, Jews or Christians. It is clear that, in the Quran, the meaning of this noun depends on the word with which it is collocated.

Likewise, when the word '*dār*' (literally, 'house') is collocated with other nouns in the Quran it can pose difficulties for translators who sometimes fail to grasp the intended meaning. Paradise ('*al-jannah*') is referred to by a range of epithets, some of which are collocations consisting of the word '*dār*' + noun, such as '*dāru almuttaqīn*' (Surah 16: 30), which Ali renders literally as 'Home of the righteous', while Abdel-Haleem translates '*dāri assalām*' (Surah 10: 25) literally as 'house of peace'. Pickthall also translates '*dāra almuqāmati*' (Surah 35: 35) and '*daru alqarār*' (Surah 40: 39) literally as 'mansion of eternity' and 'enduring home', respectively. According to Ibn-Kathir (1997, 2, 3, 5: 69, 488, 356, 489), Al-Qurtubi (2006, 10, 12, 17, 18: 480, 318, 386, 361) and Al-Tabari (1997, 4, 6: 277, 676, 294,491), all these terms refer to 'paradise'. The translators' literal versions fail to convey this meaning. This is one example of how free translation, due to its focus on content rather than form, is a more suitable approach to take when translating Quranic collocations. The free translation method allows translators to use different techniques to make the message accessible and intelligible to target readers.

Pickthall's choice in selecting the word 'scripture' for the collocation '*wa-l-kitābi l-mubyn*' or 'manifest book', as illustrated above, is questionable, as the verse that follows it in Surah 44: 3 appears to describe the Quran's specific revelation:

ʾinnā ʾanzalnāhu fī laylatin mubārakatin

We revealed it down on a blessed night (Pickthall, 1985)

This verse describes the moment when the Quran was revealed, and there are two occasions in the Quran where it says it was revealed on the 'blessed night' and 'the night of Al-Qadar'. According to exegetes Al-Qurtubi (2006), Al-Tabari (1997), Ibn Khathir (1997), Al-Razi (1995), Al-Saʿdi (2002) and Al-Baghawi (1991), among others, this refers to a specific night (or evening) in the month of Ramadan.

ʾinnā ʾanzalnāhu fī laylati l-qadr (Surah 97: 1)

Verily, We have sent it (the Quran) down in the night of Al-Qadar (Decree) (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Pickthall translates the first verse of Surah Al-Qadar literally, and consequently the meaning is unclear, as he focuses on the word 'night' which he capitalises, implying it is a special event. This may confuse target readers who are unclear about exactly what was revealed:

We revealed it on the Night of predestination (Pickthall, 1930:1938)

Although the two verses in Surah Ad-Dukhan and Surah Al-Qadar are similar in terms of meaning, Pickthall does not appear to have made the connection between them. One of the important points to bear in mind when translating the sacred text is that the Quran itself can be used to interpret the Quran: in other words, the meaning of some verses in the Quran can be explained by other verses, as in the two verses mentioned above, and this is the approach that Ibn Kathir and Tabari take, for the most part.

The examples given above are evidence of the truth of the contention that the literal translation method can distort the allegorical and figurative meanings embedded in the Quranic text and lead to confusion, whereas the free translation method can be used to convey its implicit meaning in a more faithful way.

6.3 Semantic analysis and evaluation of the selected translations

The following semantic analysis of selected collocations is supported by exegetical interpretations from the works of Ibn Khathir (1997), Al-Qurtubi (2006), Al-Tabari (1997) and Al-Razi (1995), and the works of prominent contemporary Islamic theologians including Al-Damaghany (1983) and Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987). In addition, three dictionaries were consulted: namely, DAEQU (2008), compiled by Abdel-Haleem and Badwi, DCAL (2008) by Ahmed Omar, and DLA by Ibn Manzur (1944). Ibn Khathir, Al-Qurtubi, Al-Razi and Al-Tabari sometimes support their arguments with reference to earlier Quranic interpreters and narrators of the hadiths, as well as to Arabic linguists and scholars of syntax. This section therefore begins with a brief introduction to some of these early scholars and exegetes.

According to Mohammed Al-Dahabi (2012, vol. 1), Abdullah Ibn Abbas (618-687) was the Prophet Mohammed's cousin and one of the earliest and most prominent of the Quranic exegetes. He had accompanied the Prophet Mohammed since his childhood and was only thirteen when the Prophet passed away. After Mohammed's death, Ibn Abbas became a Sahaba of Mohammed (one of the Prophet's Companions) and learnt the hadiths. He is

referred to in Arabic as the ‘ink’ or ‘sea of knowledge’ due to his vast knowledge of the Prophet’s hadiths and of Quranic interpretation.

Mujahid Ibn Jabr (642-722) was another of Mohammed’s followers. A Quranic exegete, he specialised in the fields of the hadiths and of *Figh* (Islamic jurisprudence). Some of the earlier Quranic scholars, including Al-Bukhari and Al-Shafiʿi, mainly relied on his interpretation of the Quran. It is said that Mujahid recited the Quran thirty times to Ibn Abbas, questioning him about every single verse – asking the reason for the revelation and what it meant (Al-Dahabi (2012, vol. 1). Ibn Abbas also taught Akremah Al-Barbary (646-723), another outstanding Quranic exegete, how to interpret the Quran and the *sunnah*. According to Muslim scholar Ibn Haban, Akremah is one of the most prominent scholars of *Figh* and of Quranic interpretation (Al-Dahabi (2012, vol. 1). Ibn Muzahim Al-Dahhak (660-725), another of the Prophet’s followers, was both a Quranic exegete and a narrator of the hadiths. He learnt the interpretation of the Quran from Saʿid Ibn Jubir (Al-Dahabi: 1996, vol. 4). Meanwhile, Qatadah Ibn Daʿamah (680-736) was renowned as one of the foremost interpreters of the Quran and narrators of the hadiths (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 5). Another of the Prophet’s followers, Zayd Ibn Aslam (690-753), was a jurist and a narrator of the hadiths, as well as an interpreter of the Quran. Due to his wide knowledge, he was sometimes able to interpret the Quran according to his own judgement. Some of the followers received their knowledge directly from Ibn Aslam, among these were Abdel-Rahman Ibn Zaid (his son) and Malik Ibn Anas (Al-Dahabi, 2012, vol. 1).

Muhamed Ibn Ishaq (703-768), meanwhile, specialised in the hadiths and could be trusted to narrate these faultlessly. It has been said that Ibn Ishaq memorised the hadiths extremely well (Imam Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 7). Another narrator of the hadiths, Mubarak Ibn Fadalah (690-780), was considered one of the most prominent scholars in Basra (in modern-day Iraq). Alongside Ibn Ishaq, he was also considered one of the most trustworthy narrators of the hadiths (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 7). Al-Dahabi (1996, vol, 10) also mentions Abu Dawūd Al-Ṭiālisi (750-819) as another renowned narrator the hadiths.

Moving on to the early linguists and scholars of Arabic, the names of Al-Nadar Ibn Shmil (740-818) and Ahmed Ibn Hanbel (780-855) feature prominently. The former was a scholar of the Arabic language and syntax, as well as a narrator of the hadiths (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 9). Al-Dagar (1999) mentions that the latter, Ahmed Ibn Hanbel, a Muslim theologian, jurist and narrator of the hadiths, was the founder of the Hanbali school of Sunni

jurisprudence. He also states that Ibn Hanbel was a sheikh of Islam and the most religious Muslim of his time: he was an imam of both Sunni jurisprudence and the practice of asceticism. Meanwhile, Abu Al-Abbas Ibn Yazid (known as Al-Mebred) (825-898) was another Arabic linguist and a scholar of Arabic syntax and rhetoric. He gained his knowledge from the grammarians and linguists in Basra. While still a boy, he read the work of Sībāwyh's (Al-Dali, 1997). Another early scholar, Ibu Ishaq Al-Zujaj (857-923) was a Quranic exegete and the most prominent scholar of Arabic syntax of his day (Al-Dahabi 1996, vol. 14), while Abu-Manṣūr Al-Ta'alibi (961-1038) was not only a linguist but also an author, renowned for his prose (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 17). Another leading name was that of Abu Baker Ibn Alʿ Arabi (1165-1240). A scholar of Islam as well as a philosopher, he used to write compositions for Morrocco's leaders (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 23). Finally, Al-Hasan Al-Bakri (1493-1545) is frequently mentioned as another influential Muslim scholar (Al-Dahabi, 1996, vol. 23).

Exegetical (theological) and linguistic (semantic) analysis is necessary, not only to establish the connotative meanings of the collocations but, more importantly, to determine and evaluate the methods adopted by the translators. To accomplish this task, twenty culturally specific collocational phrases from different surahs in the Quran, following six different grammatical patterns, have been selected for analysis. These are shown in the table below:

Noun+Noun (N+N) pattern =10	
ahl al-kitāb	Āl-i-'Imrān (The House of Imran) (3: 64)
qawlan thaqīlan	Al-Muzzammil (The Enwrapped One) (73:5)
dhikrun mubārakun	Al-Anbiya' (The Prophets) (21:50)
raḥmati allāhi	Āl-i-'Imrān (The House of Imran) (3: 107)
ṭarafay an-nahāri	Hud (Hud) (11:114)
Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja	Al-Kahef (The Cave) (18:94)
banī ʾisrāel	Al-Baqarah (The Cow) (2:40)
dāri s-salām	Yunus (Jonah) (10: 25)
wa-s-sābiqūna s-sābiqūn	Al-Waqi'ah (The Inevitable) (56:10)

qurrata aʾyunin	Al-Furqan (The Criterion) (25: 74)
Verb+Noun (V+N) =5	
yuqīmūna aṣṣalāta	Al-Baqarah (The Cow) (2:3):
ʾātū z zakāta	Al-Baqarah (The Cow) (2:43)
lyaqḍū tafathahum	Al-Hajj (The Pilgrimage) (22:29)
abyaḍḍat wuūjhuhum	Āl-i-'Imrān (The House of Imran) (3: 107)
thāniya ʿitfihī	Al-Hajj (The Pilgrimage) (22: 9)
Noun+Adjective (N+Adj) =2	
sirājan wahhāja	An-Naba' (The Tiding) (78:13)
al-bayti al-ʿatīq	Al-Hajj (The Pilgrimage) (22:29):
Noun+Preposition+Noun (N+P+N)=1	
wa zulafan mina al-layli	Hud (Hud) (11:114)
Preposition+Noun+Noun (P+N+N)=1	
fī ẓulumātin thalāthin	Az-Zumar (The Crowds) (39:6)
Adjective+Adjective (Adj+Adj) =1	
aṣ-ṣummu al-bukmu	Al-Anfal (Spoils of War) (8:22)

Table 6.1: Selection of collocations chosen for analysis

Each of these collocations will be examined in turn using semantic analysis to determine their meanings, followed by an evaluation of the methods employed by the three selected translators (Pickthall, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali) to render these phrases into English.

1. '*Al-bayti al-ʿatīq*' (N+Adj)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

thumma l-yaqḍū tafathahum wa-l-yūfū nudhūrahum wa-l-yaṭṭawwafū bi-l-bayti l-ʿatīq

(Surah Hajj [The Pilgrimage] 22: 29):

Then let them complete the rites prescribed for them, perform their vows, and (again) circumambulate the Ancient House. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Then let them make an end of their unkemptness and pay their vows and go around the Ancient House. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

Then let them complete the prescribed duties (*Manâsik* of *Hajj*) for them, and perform their vows, and circumambulate the Ancient House (the Ka'ba at Makkah). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

According to DCAL (2008, 267), the meaning of the phrase '*al-bayti al-ʿatīq*' (literally, 'the ancient house') is 'the Holy Kaʿbah'. Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987, 207) notes that the word '*al-bayt*' is mentioned eight times in the Quran, with a range of different meanings. It is most commonly used to mean 'house' but it is also used to indicate a mosque, a nest, a prison, the Kaʿbah, a tent and a cave. Ibn Khathir (1999, 3: 194-95), Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 426-27) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 14: 381-84) all assert that '*al-bayti al-ʿatīq*' refers to the Kaʿbah in Mecca. However, Al-Tabari points to disagreements among the Prophet Mohammed's companions and followers regarding the origin of this epithet: Al-Zubair (670-742), Mujahid (642-722) and Qatadah (680-736) (followers of the Prophet) argued that it describes the way that Allah protected the Kaʿbah against tyrannical forces that threatened it with devastation; others, however, believed that its name refers to the fact that no one can claim ownership of it. Al-Razi (1995, 12: 31) adds that Mujahid thought this title reflected the fact that the Ka'bah was saved from the Flood. However, according to Ibn Zayd, it was the first place (or house) established for the worship of Allah – the Ka'ba was established by the prophet Ibrahim (Abraham) and his son Ismail centuries before the advent of Islam (see Surah 2: 127) – and Al-Tabari (1997) maintains that this is likely to be the main reason for referring to the Ka'bah in this way. The entry in DAEQU for the phrase '*al-bayti al-ʿatīq'* reads as follows:

([E]pithet for Ka'bah) meaning either the Ancient House, so-named because it was the first house of God to be founded on the earth (3: 96) or the Freed House because it was freed from human ownership, from the attacks by the Abyssinians (narrated in surah 105), from the Flood or from other such afflictions. (DAEQU, 2008, 597)

Evaluation of the translations

Both Ali and Pickthall render the Quranic collocation '*al-bayti al-ʿatīq'* literally as 'the Ancient House', which could be confusing: target readers may not understand that this is a reference to the Ka'bah, and Western readers in particular may find it difficult to grasp the intended meaning as the Ka'bah is not a part of their religious culture. In such a case, translators should focus on conveying the message rather than preserving the original grammatical structure of the source language: Nida and Taber (2003, 12) recommend that 'the translator must strive for equivalence rather than identity. In a sense this is just another way of emphasizing the reproduction of the message rather than the conservation of the form of the utterance.' Al-Hilali and Khan also use a calque (a literal translation) but then add an explanation in parentheses ('the Ka'ba at Makkah') to raise audience awareness. This exemplifies how translators can use different translation strategies with free translation method to transfer the allegorical meaning of a collocation in an informative way to their readership.

2. '*Ahl al-kitāb*' (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

qul yā-ʾahla l-kitābi taʿālawʾilā kalimatin sawāʾin baynanā wa-baynakum (Surah Āl-i-'Imrān [The House of Imran] 3: 64)

Say: O People of the Scripture! Come to an agreement between us and you. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

Say: O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Say (O Muhammad): 'O people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians): Come to a word that is just between us and you'. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

The word 'book' in the Quran carries different meanings depending on the collocant with which it is associated, and therefore, in order to understand the situational context of the verse in which it appears, it is necessary to grasp the word's intended sense. Al-Jawzy's (1987, 163) definition of 'people' includes relatives and kin who share the same ancestry or are related by marriage. However, Al-Damaghany (1983, 53), DCAL (2008, 135-136) and DAEQU (2008, 797) all agree that '*ahl al-kitāb*' (literally, 'people of the book') refers to the Jews and Christians because Allah sent them their own sacred texts through Jesus and Moses. According to the *tafsīr* of Ibn Khathir (1997, 1: 330), Al-Tabari (1997, 2: 292) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 5: 160-61) argue that this verse was revealed when Allah ordered the Prophet Mohammed to address the Christians in Najran and the Jews in Medina so as to reach an agreement with them; hence, this phrase refers to both these groups. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 5: 161) and Ibn Kathir (1997, 1: 330) assert that the Prophet Mohammed also included this verse in a message he sent to Heraclius, the Byzantine Emperor (610-641), urging him to embrace Islam:

> In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, and the Most Merciful. From Muhammed, the messenger of Allah, to Heraclius, Leader of Romans. Peace be upon those who follow the true path, having said that, convert to Islam, and you will gain safety, and convert to Islam and Allah grants you a double reward. However, if you turn away from this, then you will carry the sins of the peasants.

Al-Razi (1995, 4: 95-96) identifies three possible meanings of '*ahl al-kitāb*': the Jews in Medina, the Christians in Najran, or both these groups. He adds that he believes that this designation refers to both the Christians and the Jews as they are also people of 'the book' (i.e. the Bible and the Torah), and echoes the way in which the 'keepers' of the Quran (who memorise and pass on the sacred text) are addressed. Al-Razi also notes that the epithet indicates the wish to confer honour upon the addressees and to 'soften their hearts'.

Evaluation of the translations

By rendering this phrase literally, Ali fails to convey its intended meaning: it could sound alien to target readers, particularly those without a specialist knowledge of Islamic terms. Most native speakers of Arabic would understand the meaning of this phrase because it is

part of their cultural and religious background, but this would not be the case for the target readership. Larson cautions against using literal translation for rendering the meaning from the source language into the target language:

> A literal translation is useful if one is studying the structure of the source text as in an interlinear translation, but a literal translation does not communicate the meaning of the source text. It is generally no more than a string of words intended to help someone read a text in its original language. It is unnatural and hard to understand, and may even be quite meaningless, or give a wrong meaning in the receptor language. (Larson 1984, 10)

This suggests that the translation of the Quranic text sometimes requires the application of strategies other than that of literal translation to render its underlying meaning successfully.

To some extent, Pickthall's choice of a semantic translation method means that he is able to render the collocation more appropriately, but to be more informative he could have mentioned both Christians and Jews in his translation. Al-Hilali and Khan adopt a free translation and use the phrase 'people of the Scripture', adding parenthetically 'Jews and Christians'. Employing this paraphrase strategy provides more information and helps target readers to better grasp the intended meaning.

3. '*Qawlan thaqīlan*' (N+Adj)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *ʾinnā sa-nulqīʿalayka qawlan thaqīla* (Surah Al-Muzzammil [The Enwrapped One] 73: 5)
>
> Verily, We shall send down to you a weighty Word (i.e. obligations, laws) (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> For we shall charge thee with a word of weight (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)
>
> Soon shall We send down to thee a weighty Message (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Semantic analysis

According to Al-Jawzy (1987, 225-27) and Al-Damaghany (1983, 150), the exegetes give ten different meanings for the word 'weight': (1) heaviness; (2) the dead; (3) properties and belongings; (4) hardship; (5) overbalance; (6) burdens; (7) attachment to life; (8) the elderly;

(9) human beings and jinns; and (10) solemn and important discourse; the last is exemplified by the phrase '*qawlan thaqylan*' (literally, 'a word of weight'). Al-Damaghany (1983) reports that, for Mujahid, the description 'weighty' encompasses both lawful (*ḥalal*) and unlawful (*ḥaram*) discourse, but Al-Hasan states that it only refers to those who follow the rules of the Quran.

Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 370-71) and Al-Tabari (1997, 7: 439) all affirm that in this verse Allah addresses the Prophet Mohammed, sending him '*qawlan thaqīlan*' (literally 'a weighty word') containing the Quranic rules and obligations. Al-Qurtubi (1997, 21: 324-25) explains that these obligations relate, for example, to performing the prescribed prayers during the night, which requires a person to accept the hardship of waking from sleep to pray, resisting Satan (i.e. the urge to forgo these prayers and return to sleep). He notes that Qatadah describes the Quran as a 'word of weight', due to the sacred obligations and regulations it contains. Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 370-71) further expounds that Imam Ahmed Ibn Hanbal (780-855) recorded the following from Abdullah bin Amro:

> I asked the Prophet Mohammed, how do you feel when a revelation comes to you?' The Prophet replied, 'I hear a ringing and then I stay calm when that appears, and every time when the revelation comes to me, I think that my soul is about to be taken [in death].'

Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 370-71) adds that in Sahih Al-Bukhari, the Prophet's wife, Aisha, narrates: 'Verily, I saw him (Muhammed) receiving revelation and I noticed the sweat dropping from his forehead on a very cold day till the revelation ended.'

Al-Razi (1995, 15: 175-76) asserts that '*qawlan thaqīlan'* has ten possible interpretations referring to different aspects of the Quran: (1) the Quran is 'weighty' because it is a great discourse; (2) it includes sacred regulations and prohibitions; (3) according to Al-Hasan, a follower of Muhammed, it will weigh in the balance on the Last Day, an indication of its value and the fact that acting upon its commands will bring great spiritual rewards; (4) the Prophet Muhammed felt 'weighty' when he received the divine revelation of the Quran (Al-Razi refers to Hadith Aisha, also mentioned by Ibn Kathir, above); (5) the Quran is 'weighty', in that it does not include unimportant details or speech that is easy to understand, because it comes from Allah and because of (6) its valuable, unyielding and powerful discourse; (7) the Quran also places 'weighty' burdens on disbelievers, revealing their

secrets and forbidding their religions and their public statements; (8) the Quran is also 'weighty' because it will exist forever and never disappear; and because (9) no one can fully comprehend its meaning or its value; and because (10) it includes '*al-nāsikh*' and '*al-mansūkh*', as well as '*al-muḥkam*' and '*al-mutashābih*', and the differences between these two divisions can only be understood by respected Islamic scholars.

To clarify the last point, Qadhi (1990) gives a brief explanation of the differences between *al-muḥkam* and *al-mutashābih* – the former is the one that is explicit and can be understood by everyone. He gives the example of surah (1:1):

> All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds (Qadhi 1990, 208)

Therefore, the verse is *muḥkam* since its meaning is clear and understandable, whereas *al-mutashābih* has two meanings: the first is 'resembling' and the second is 'unclear', which is usually associated with the first meaning because it is not easy to distinguish between two objects that are alike. Qadhi provides an example from the Quran in which the Jewish people say:

> [T]o us, all cows look alike [*tashābaha*]' (Qadhi 1990, 208)

Qadhi asserts that in this saying the word is used in its first meaning ('resembling'). However, it means 'unclear' in the hadith of the Prophet Mohammed in which he says:

> The *halal* is clear and the *haram* is clear, but between the two are matters which are unclear [*mutashābihat*] (Qadhi 1990, 208)

Al-Zuhari (2008, 55-56) also clarifies the differences between '*al-nāsikh*' and '*al-mansūkh*' – the former involves eliminating or abrogating a first rule and the second indicates its replacement with another. He illustrates this with the following example: initially, Allah revealed a decree that ruled that Muslims should face Jerusalem when they prayed. However, after Mohammed had migrated from Mecca to Medina, Allah revealed *al-nāsikh* (a second decree) which replaced *al-mansūkh* (the first one): thereafter, people started to pray facing the Ka'bah at Mecca. Al-Zuhari refers to the surah 2: 144:

> *qad narā taqalluba wajhika fī s-samāʾi fa-la-nuwalliyannaka qiblatan tarḍāhā fa-walli wajhakashaṭral-masjidi l-ḥarāmi wa-ḥaythu mā kuntum fa-wallū wujūhakum shaṭrahū*

> Verily! We have seen the turning of your (Mohammad's ﷺ) face towards the heaven. Surely, We shall turn you to a *Qiblah* (prayer direction) that shall please you, so turn your face in the direction of *Al-Masjid- al-Hāram* (at Makkah). And wheresoever you people are, turn your faces (in prayer) in that direction. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1996)

Meanwhile, in DAEQU (2008), the meaning of '*qawlan thaqīlan*' in Surah Al-Muzzammil (73: 5) is said to be 'a weighty discourse', but this definition is uninformative as it does not reflect the implied meaning of the collocation. As shown above, translators should always take into account that target readers will not understand the depth of allusion and the cultural connotations contained in the source language.

Evaluation of the translations

Pickthall's literal translation of the phrase '*qawlan thaqīlan*' as 'a word of weight' is not sufficiently precise enough to reflect its intended meaning, which refers to the obligations and regulations specified in the Quran. Consequently, target readers may wonder which 'word' exactly is revealed to Mohammed. As Abdul-Raof comments, translators should not be limited by the structure of the source language; rather, they need to use different strategies to transfer the meaning of the text into the target language:

> The intrinsic syntactic, semantic and pragmatic differences in languages lead to cases of both non-equivalence and untranslatability between languages; we are, therefore, shackled by these limitations. The translator, however, has to free himself/herself of these shackles in order to achieve an acceptable, informative, and effective translation by observing the target language linguistic and cultural norms. (Abdul-Raof (2001: 9)

In this instance, Ali's free translation strategy is the more informative of the three translations in that it better reflects the collocation's intended meaning. He uses a semantic translation, 'weighty message', with a footnote explaining that this is a reference to the Quran. Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation technique – that is, employing a calque or literal translation followed by an explanatory paraphrase, 'obligations, laws' – is also satisfactory: their translation is informative and it reflects the intended meaning of the collocation. Therfere, footnote and paraphrase strategies are useful to be used within free translation method.

4. '*yuqīmūna ṣ-ṣalāta*' (V+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *alladhīna yuʾminūna bi-l-ghaybi wa-yuqīmūna ṣ-ṣalāta* (Surah Al-Baqarah [The Cow] 2:3)
>
> Who believe in the Unseen, are steadfast in prayer (Ali, 1934: 1975)
>
> Who believe in the *Ghaib* and perform *As-Salat (Iqamat as-Salat)* (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> Who believe in the Unseen, and establish worship (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

Semantic analysis

In general terms, '*aṣ-ṣalāt*' (prayer) includes the five obligatory prayers performed over the course of the day: *fajr* (dawn), *dhuhr* (midday), *asr* (afternoon), *maghrib* (sunset) and *isha* (night) (DCAL, 2008, 1316). However, Al-Jawzy (1987, 395-96) asserts that this word has different denotative meanings depending on the Quranic context, namely: (1) obligatory prayer, in reference to this specific verse; (2) seeking forgiveness; (3) '*duʿā*' (supplication); (4) reading the Quran; (5) the religion of Islam; (6) specifically, the *asr* prayer; (7) a funeral prayer; and (8) the '*juʾma*' (Friday) prayer.

Based on the commentaries of Al-Tabari (1997, 1: 105-106), Al-Qurtubi (2006, 1: 253) and Ibn Khathir (1997, 1: 55) (the latter cites Ibn Abbas (618-687) and Qatādah (680-736) to add weight to his argument), 'performing a prayer' means performing it dutifully by bowing and prostrating oneself with '*khushūʿ*' (humility) and attentiveness. Qatādah adds two further elements: being punctual and performing '*wudūʾ*' (ablution) before praying.Al-Qurtubi defines '*iqāmat*' as establishing something regularly while Al-Tabari argues that the root of '*aṣ-ṣalāt*' in Arabic is '*duʿā*' because supplication forms a part of prayer.

Evaluation of the translations

Pickthall's literal translation lacks accuracy and may lead to confusion since 'worship' might include fasting, righteous deeds or other ritual activities rather than just prayer. Although Ali's semantic translation renders the word '*aṣ-ṣalāt*' accurately as 'prayer', his use of the

word ‘steadfast’ seems too strong in this context. On the other hand, Al-Hilali and Khan translate the meaning freely, informatively and accurately by using a calque followed by a cultural-borrowing technique, and then clarifying the concept of ‘*aṣ-ṣalāt*’ by contextualising it, explaining its relevance in Islam, in a footnote. This makes the message more accessible and intelligible to their target readers. Joseph Suh (2005, 123-124) defines cultural borrowing as ‘the process of taking over a SL expression verbatim from the source text into the target text and the borrowed term may remain unaltered in form or may undergo minor alteration or transliteration’. He emphasises the importance of using cultural borrowing when needed:

> The translator will resort to [cultural borrowing] when it proves impossible to find a suitable target language expression of indigenous origins for translating the source text expression. A vital condition for cultural borrowing is that the textual context of the target text should make the meaning of the borrowed expression clear. (Suh, 2005, 124)

In this case, Al-Hilali and Khan are right to elucidate the meaning of their instance of cultural borrowing in the target language. In general, the free translation method is more suitable in rendering the Islamic concept of performing ‘*aṣ-ṣalāt*’ as this method uses different strategies such as cultural borrowing followed by footnot.

5. ‘*ʾātū z-zakāta’* (V+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *wa-ʾaqīmū ṣ-ṣalāta wa-ʾātū z-zakāta* (Surah Al-Baqarah [The Cow] 2: 43)
>
> And be steadfast in prayer; Practise regular charity (Ali, 1934: 1975)
>
> And perform *As-Salat* (*Iqamat as-Salat*), and give *Zakat* (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> Establish worship, pay the poor-due (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

Semantic analysis

‘*Zakāh*’, one of the pillars of Islam, is an amount of money that is taken from a person’s surplus wealth and given to the poor. ‘*Zakāt al-fiṭr*’ refers to the duty imposed on all those Muslims who can afford it to provide food to sustain poorer people at the end of Ramadan,

before the Eid prayer (DCAL, 2008, 989). Al-Damaghany (1983, 250) asserts that in this verse paying '*zakāt'* is obligatory. The word '*zakāh*' is described in DAEQU (2008, 400), as 'the specified portion of certain types of one's possessions annually given/extracted as [an] obligatory due to God in order that the givers may purify their wealth and themselves'. Ibn Kathir (1997, 1: 90), Al-Tabari (1997, 1: 207) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 2: 23) make multiple references to *zakāh* as a compulsory act for Muslims that purifies the giver spiritually as well as purifying their material wealth. They identify two types of *zakāt*: '*zakāt al-fiṭr*' (see above) and '*zakāt al-māl*' (money): it is compulsory for those who have enough money to give part of it to those in need. Commentators maintain that in this verse Allah is addressing the Jews in Medina, commanding them to believe in Mohammed, perform prayer and give *zakāh*. Al-Hasan's comments (that *zakāh* is obligatory and good deeds will not be accepted without performing prayer and giving *zakāh*) are confirmed by Ibn Kathīr (1997), who cites Mubarak (690-780) on this subject. Al-Qurtubi (2006) and Al-Tabari (1997) declare that term refers to the purification that the giver receives from Allah, and Al-Tabari adds that it is derived from the verb '*zakka*', meaning to increase and grow, since Allah blesses those who give *zakāh*, while Al-Razi (1995: vol. 2, 48) asserts that the word '*zakāh*' in the Arabic language means both growth and purification, and therefore the performing *zakāh* ensures that the giver receives a blessing that includes an increase in material and spiritual wealth, and the erasing of past sins.

Evaluation of the translations

Ali's use of the phrase 'practice regular charity' may be too loose to accurately render the culturally specific concept of '*zakāh*' as it could refer to any kind of donation, including food, clothes, and other items, as well as money. As Baker (1992, 85) comments, 'it is difficult to find a notional meaning which is regularly and uniformly expressed in all languages'. Consequently, without further explanation, this semantic translation may appear ambiguous to the target readers.

Al-Hilali and Khan, meanwhile, adopt a cultural borrowing technique for their version of the verse, using the term 'give *Zakāt*'; however, they should have elucidated the meaning for those readers who are not familiar with a concept that can only be understood by Arab and Muslim readers, or by a specialist in Islamic terms. Non-Arabic-speaking readers unacquainted with Islam would find it difficult to comprehend this term without an explanation that puts it in context. For example, Rowaa El-Maghazi (2004, 106) emphasises

that ‘a loan word is used as a solution when the translator feels that there is no lexical equivalent to equate or express the source text word or concept. However, it gives zero meaning to the reader unless its sense is fully described.’ Pickthall, however, uses a free translation, ‘pay a poor due’, defining it in a footnote as ‘a tax at a fixed rate in proportion to the worth of property, collected from the well-to-do and distributed among the poor Muslims’. Although this free translation seems the most appropriate, he should have clarified the Islamic concept of *zakāh* in more detail.

6. ‘*lyaqḍū tafathahum*’ (V+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

thumma l-yaqḍū tafathahum wa-l-yūfū nudhūrahum wa-l-yaṭṭawwafū bi-l-bayti l-ʿatīq

(Surah Hajj [The Pilgrimage] 22: 29)

Then let them make an end of their unkemptness and pay their vows and go around the Ancient House. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938).

Then let them complete the prescribed duties (*Manâsik* of *Hajj*) for them, and perform their vows, and circumambulate the Ancient House (the Ka’ba at Makkah). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Then let them complete the rites prescribed for them, perform their vows, and (again) circumambulate the Ancient House. (Abdullah Ali, 1934: 1975)

Semantic analysis

The collocate ‘*tafathahum*’ is a classical Arabic word which is quite difficult to understand. Based on the commentaries of Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 194) and Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 427), this word means ‘*iḥram*’, which includes shaving your head, trimming your nails and moustache, plucking out armpit hairs, wearing ordinary clothes, the stoning of Jamarat (see below), and standing on mounts Arafat and Mozdaliva. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 14: 378-79) refers to Arabic lexicographers such as Ibn Shmil (740-818), who claims the word ‘*tafath*’ in Arabic means removing untidiness by shaving your head (and so on), and Ibn Al-‘Arabi (1165-1240) who believes that the word appears strange when pronounced in the Arabic language and is not used in Arabic poetry. However, Al-Qurtubi (2006) reports that Al-Ta‘alibi (961-1038)

believed that the origin of the word '*tafath*' lies in its original meaning of 'dirt', as Arab people would use it as an insult: 'how *tafath* [dirty] you are!'

Al-Razi (1995, 12: 31), meanwhile, reports that Al-Zujaj (857-923) claims that Arab linguists have only recently recognised the meaning of '*lyaqḍū tafathahum* (*tafath*)' as it appears in the Quran, and that, according to Al-Mebred (825-898), the original meaning of '*tafath*' is dirt, and therefore in this verse it refers to removing dirt and a dishevelled appearance, as the word '*liyaqẓū*' here means to eliminate '*tafath*'. According to the Lisan Al-Arab Dictionary (1955, 2: 120-21), '*lyaqḍū tafathahum*' means plucking out hairs and trimming your nails. The dictionary reports that Ibn Al'Arabi states that this includes all sort of shaving and cleaning of the body, while Ibn Abbas declares that '*tafath*' not only refers to this but also to slaughtering animals, as well as the stoning of Jamarat. (The latter refers to a ritual performed during the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, when the faithful throw pebbles at the three walls – formerly, pillars – called 'jamarat', in the city of Mina, just east of Mecca.) The dictionary elaborates further, reporting that Abu Mansour states that Ibn Shmail interprets the word best as removing the appearance of being unkempt or untidy.

Evaluation of the translations

From the above discussion, it can be noted that the collocation '*lyaqḍū tafathahum*' (literally, 'remove their unkemptness') includes an implicit meaning, and therefore Pickthall's literal translation, 'make an end of their unkemptness', does not convey the collocation's full meaning. His approach only transfers the surface meaning. Pickthall appears able to grasp the meaning of the unusual Arabic word '*tafath*' but does not seem to understand its sense in this context; he could otherwise have used a footnote or a marginal explanation to convey its intended meaning. In contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali are able to convey the appropriate meaning: Al-Hilali and Khan use a paraphrase, '*Manāsik* of *Hajj*', and Abdullah Ali chooses the word 'rites'. Both translations are followed by footnotes elucidating the meaning, which reflects that found in the above-mentioned exegetical works. Their free translation method, and the compensation strategies they use such as paraphrases and footnotes ensure the message is accessible to the target reader. Dickins et al. emphasise the importance of using compensation when translating:

> [I]t is the reduction of an unacceptable translation loss through the calculated introduction of a less unacceptable one. Or, to put it differently, a deliberately introduced translation loss is a small price to pay if it is used to avoid the more

serious loss that would be entailed by literal translation. (Dickins et al., 2002, 49)

The translator should, therefore, consider the contextual meaning of a verse in order to achieve an acceptable translation.

7. '*Dhikrun mubārakun*' (N+Adj)

The Quranic collocation and its translation

wa-hādhā dhikrun mubārakun ʾanzalnāhu ʾa-fa-ʾantum lahū munkirūn

[The Prophets] 21: 50)

And this is a blessed Message which We have Sent down: will ye then Reject it? (Ali, 1934: 1975).

And this is a blessed Reminder (the Qur'an) which We have sent down, will you then (dare to) deny it? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).

This is a blessed Reminder that we have revealed: Will ye then reject it? (Pickthall, 1930: 1938).

Semantic analysis

Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987, 301-305) provides twenty different connotative meanings in the Quran for the word '*dhikr*'. These include (1) to remember Allah in speech; (2) to remember Allah; (3) narrating; (4) news; (5) a lesson; (6) monotheism; (7) revelation; (8) the Quran; (9) the Torah; (10) honour; (11) obedience; (12) memorising; (13) unseen; (14) the five obligatory prayers; (15) *al-juʾma* (Friday) prayers; (16) the *isha* (evening) prayer; (17) *al-lawḥuʾl-maḥfūẓ* (the 'preserved tablet'); (18) praise; (19) the Prophet, and (20) statements. Al-Damaghany (1983, 218-19) mentions eighteen of these. Both theologians argue that the collocation '*dikrun mubārakun*' refers to the Quran. Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987) states that the word 'reminder' here could be applied to the heart or the tongue.

Ibn Khathir (1997, 3: 162), Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 362) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 14: 215) explain that in the Quran, Surah 21: 48-49 refers to Moses and Haron (Aaron) receiving the revelation of the Torah, which it describes as a 'shining light'. The Torah is revered as a set of religious guidelines laying out what is right and wrong, as well as a reminder to the pious

who fear Allah, both now and at the Last Day. They add that later, in Surah 21: 50, the Quran is also called 'a blessed reminder', sent down to Mohammed in the same way as the Torah was to Moses and Aaron, so who could doubt or disbelieve it since it represents truth and clarity. Al-Razi (1995, 11: 180) further states that '*dhikrun mubārakun*' implies that the Quran brings blessings and essential knowledge.

Evaluation of the translation

Al-Hilali's and Khan's version successfully conveys this culturally specific collocation by using a calque translation followed by a parenthetical note –'the Qur'an'–to clarify its implicit meaning. Therefore, free translation approach uses a calque strategy followed by paraphrase strategy attempts to translate the meaning of the word within its context and within target language requirement. However, both Pickthall and Ali render the collocation inappropriately. The former uses literal translation to render this as 'a blessed Reminder', but unlike Al-Hilali and Khan, he fails to clarify the intended meaning of this phrase, potentially confusing target readers who could be led to believe that this verse is a reference to the Torah. Meanwhile, Ali uses a modified literal translation and accompanies it with a footnote stating that this is a reference to a man who is greater than Moses and a book that is greater than the Torah. The fact that he does not clarify which individual and which book he is referring to means that his explanation only leads to further ambiguity. However, if the grammatical structure of this verse is taken into account, it can be seen that the text has shifted from the past events of Surah 21: 48 (referring to the Torah), which are recounted in the past tense, to the present, reflected in its use of the present tense to refer to the Quran. Also, a connector followed by a demonstrative pronoun is used at the beginning of the verse, 'and this blessed reminder', indicating the shift to another topic – namely, the Quran. Moreover, Allah's question (addressed particularly to the Quraysh people) is: 'Will you deny it?' This question obviously does not refer to the Torah, otherwise the question would have been posed in the past tense. Therefore, it is undoubtedly aimed at those who deny the Quran. Ali *et al*. (2012, 588) later assert that 'in translating the Holy Quran, tense and verb form should be guided by the overall context and by stylistic considerations', indicating that he does appear to recognise the need to pay close attention to the Arabic grammar and syntax of the Quran, particularly as this can sometimes help the translator to understand the meaning of the verses and the linkages between them.

8-9. *Abyaḍḍat wujūhuhum*' (passive V+N) and '*raḥmati allahi*' (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

wa-ʾammā lladhīna byaḍḍat wujūhuhum fa-fī raḥmati llāhi hum fīhā khālidūn

(Surah Āl-i-'Imrān [The House of Imran] 3: 107)

And for those whose faces will become white, they will be in Allah's Mercy (Paradise), therein they shall dwell forever. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).

And as for those whose faces have been whitened, in the mercy of Allah they dwell for ever. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938).

But those whose faces Will be [lit with] white – they will be in [the light of] God's mercy: therein to dwell [for ever]. (Ali, 1934: 1975).

Semantic analysis

According to DCAL (2008, 270), '*abyaḍḍa allawn*' (literally, 'whitening the colour') means 'to turn white and gradually become shining', and the term 'a face becomes white' means it brightens with delight and joy. Al-Jawzy (1987, 331-34) defines '*raḥma*' as a favour for those in need, and both Al-Jawzy and Al-Damaghany (1983, 225) state that, in this verse, the collocation '*raḥmati allahi*' means 'paradise'. According to Ibn Kathir (1997, 1: 346), Al-Tabari (1997, 2: 353) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 5: 258), this verse describes the situation on the Last Day when the faces of sinners will darken in sorrow, in anticipation of punishment, while the faces of those who have obeyed Allah – following His orders, abstaining from bad deeds and abiding by the *sunnah* – will be become 'white' (i.e. bright with happiness) as they will feel '*raḥmati allahi*' ('Allah's mercy') and enter paradise. Al-Razi (1995, 4: 186-87) clarifies the connotative meaning of faces turning 'white' or 'black/dark', explaining that these are metaphors meaning delighted and happy or sad and sorrowful, respectively. He cites Surah (16: 58) in support of his claim:

> And when the news of (the birth of) a female (child) is brought to any of them, his face becomes dark, and he is filled with inward grief! (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Al-Razi (1995, vol. 4, 186-87) adds that in Arabic the phrase, '*andī yad bayḍā*' ('I have a white hand'), means 'I will give you something that will delight you'. He also notes that

‘*abyaḍḍa wajhuhu*’ (‘his face has become white’) is used to refer to someone who has been successful, and is therefore full of happiness and joy. Consequently, the phrase ‘*alhamdu lil Allahi aladhī byyaḍa wajhaka*’ (‘Thank God that he turned your face white’) is used when congratulating someone. Hence, in Surah (3: 107), the faces of those who have reached paradise become ‘white’ or radiant with joy. Al-Razi explains that, according to Ibn Abbas’s interpretation of ‘*rahmati allahi*’ as meaning ‘paradise’, this indicates that only those who are obedient to Allah will feel the joy of entering heaven.

Evaluation of the translations

This verse includes two collocations, and none of the three translators have rendered the first collocation appropriately, as they all adopt a literal translation strategy which does not convey the implicit meaning of ‘*abyaḍḍat wujūhuhum*’ to their target readers, who would struggle to grasp its true sense. This type of translation would not be a problem for most native Arabic speakers who would be aware of the implicit meaning of the collocation, especially as it is common in Arabic culture to use synonymous religious terms in everyday speech. For example, the term ‘lightened faces’ is often used to indicate that someone is pious and Allah is satisfied in them. DAEQU (2008, 1014) gives the meaning of this phrase as ‘some faces will be delighted’, referring to those whose faces will be radiant with joy. The choice of the word ‘delighted’ is therefore adequate for conveying the implicit meaning of the collocation. Ali (1934: 1983, viii), commenting on the particular difficulties of translating the Quran, observes: ‘Classical Arabic has a vocabulary in which the meaning of each root-word is so comprehensive that it is difficult to interpret it in a modern analytical language word for word, or by the use of the same word in all places where the original word occurs in the text.’ Baker (2002, 26), meanwhile, suggests that a good strategy in such instances is to substitute a specific word with a more general one, as this is ‘one of the commonest strategies for dealing with many types of non-equivalence, particularly in the area of propositional meaning’. Translators, therefore, should be aware that literal translation at times will not necessarily convey the intended meaning of the word.

Pickthall renders the second collocation literally, and his translation succeeds in reflecting its positive meaning, but target readers may fail to grasp its implicit meaning of ‘paradise’. Although Ali employs a semantic translation, readers may still be unable to grasp the collocation’s implicit meaning. In contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan translate this collocation suitably for their target audience by using free translation to elucidate the intended meaning

and placing the word ‘paradise’ in parentheses. Free translation uses different strategies and uses natural forms of the target language so that the message can be clearly understood by the target audience.

10. ‘*Aṣ-ṣummu al-bukmu*’ (Adj+Adj)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *ʾinna sharra d-dawābbi ʿinda llāhi ṣ-ṣummu l-bukmu lladhīna lā yaʿqilūn (Surah Al-Anfal [Spoils of War] 8: 22)*
>
> Lo! the worst of beasts in Allah's sight are the deaf, the dumb, who have no sense. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938).
>
> Verily! The worst of (moving) living creatures with Allah are the deaf and the dumb, those who understand not (i.e. the disbelievers). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).
>
> Verily! The worst of (moving) living creatures with Allah are the deaf and the dumb, those who understand not (i.e. the disbelievers). (Ali, 1934: 1975).

Semantic analysis

In DCAL (2008, 235-36), ‘*aṣṣummu al-bukm*’ is defined as those who are determined not to listen to the truth or be guided to the right path, a reference to its usage in the Quran. The dictionary illustrates this with the phrase ‘*bakuma al-rajul*’ (‘the man became dumb’), meaning (in this context) someone who pretends to be unable to speak. Similarly, according to DAEQU (2008, 109 and 537), the word ‘*bukm*’ in the Quran means ‘dumbness; muteness; inability to express oneself; being silent; being ignorant’. DAEQU also defines the intransitive verb ‘*aṣamm*’ as ‘to be or become deaf; to close one’s ears’, meaning to refuse to listen, and cites Surah Al-Ma’idah (The Table) (5:71): ‘and they thought no harm could afflict them and so they closed their eyes and ears’ (literally, were blind and deaf), which is similar to the use of this collocation in Surah Al-Anfal (8:22).

According to Ibn Kathir (1997, 2: 258-59), Al-Tabari (1997, 4: 55-56) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 9: 482), this verse originally referred to the disbelievers of Quraysh, who were called ‘deaf’ as they were unwilling to listen to what was right, and ‘dumb’ because they did not attempt to understand Islam and the Quran. Ibn Khathir and Al-Qurtubi report that some exegetes assert that this verse was meant to specifically refer to the Bani Abd-Addar (one of

the Qurayshi tribes). However, Ibn Khathir cites Ibn Abbas (618-687, Mujahid (642-722) and Ibn Ishaq (703-768), who interpret the verse more generally as referring to hypocrites, and argues that there is no difference between hypocrites and disbelievers, because neither perform righteous deeds. He links this with the following verse (2:171):

> And the example of those who disbelieve is as that of him who shouts to the (flock of sheep) that hears nothing but calls and cries. (They are) deaf, dumb and blind. So they do not understand. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).

Evaluation of the translations

Pickthall, because he uses a literal translation for the culturally specific collocation 'the deaf and the dumb' and fails to add further clarification, does not convey its intended message. His readers, therefore, could be led to believe that this phrase is a reference is to deaf and dumb people in general, leaving them in some confusion over the meaning of the verse itself. As Beekman and Callow (1974, 47) assert, 'experience in translation has confirmed that leaving the implicit information of the original implicit in the RL [receptor language] version can mislead the RL version and cause them to misunderstand the original message'. Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali, however. Produce identical versions that are more appropriate because the authors follow their literal translation, 'the deaf and the dumb', with information referring to the contextual meaning of the phrase (i.e. 'disbelievers'). By offering an explanation in a paraphrase, these authors are able to transfer the intended meaning of the collocation into the target language. However, they should have also used a footnote to explain why disbelievers are called 'deaf and dumb' in this context and sometimes a paraphrase technique alone is not sufficient to convey the meaning of a collocation. Free translation allows the translator to use more than one strategy to render some terms clearly to the target audience. It mainly focuses on the intended meaning of the source text without paying attentions to syntax, style, and grammatical structures of the original text.

11. '*Dāri s-salām*' (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *wa-llāhu yadʿū ʾilā dāri s-salām* (Surah Yunus [Jonah] 10: 25)
>
> And Allah summoneth to <u>the abode of peace</u> (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

> Allah calls to the home of peace (i.e. Paradise, by accepting Allah's religion of Islamic Monotheism and by doing righteous good deeds and abstaining from polytheism and evil deeds) (Al-Hilali and Khan 1974: 1996)
>
> But Allah doth call to the Home of Peace (Ali, 1934: 1975).

Semantic analysis

According to DAEQU (2008, 451) and Al-Damaghany (1983, 135) '*dāri s-salām*' (literally, 'the house of peace') means paradise. The latter source reports that it is also said to mean monotheism and forgiveness. Ibn Kathir (1997, 2: 365), Al-Tabari (1997, 4: 276-78) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 10: 480-82) all argue that '*dāri s-salām*' in this context refers to paradise because a preceding Quranic verse (10:24) explains that life is fleeting, and in this verse (10: 25) people are invited to worship Allah in order to receive their reward – that is, to enter paradise. Ibn Kathir (1997) reports that Ibn Jarir, Ibn Abi Hatim and Ibn Ad-Darda all state that the Prophet Mohammed said:

> Every day the sun rises, two angels descend next to it and call and all creatures would hear except humans and Jinn and say: O people! Come to your Lord! What being little and sufficient is better than what being much and rivalry.

Then, it is said, the Prophet Mohammed recited the verse '*wa-llāhu yadʿū ʾilā dāri s-salām'* (literally, 'Allah calls to the Home of Peace'), meaning 'O people come to your Lord'. Al-Qurṭubī (2006) refers to Al-Tabari who, in turn, reports that Qatadah (680-736) and Al-Hasan (1493-1545) explained that paradise is called 'the House of Peace' because those who enter it will be free from all worldly problems, and because the word '*salām*' (peace) is one of Allah's many names. Al-Razi (1995, 9: 78-79) concurs that '*dāri s-salām*' means paradise because '*salām*' is Allah's name and paradise is His 'house'. Allah has the epithet *salām* because, as Surah (41: 46) says, 'your Lord is not at all unjust to (His) slaves' (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974, 1996). Al-Razi (1995, 9: 78-79) adds that those who enter paradise will be safe, protected from all problems, including death, disease, pain, disbelief, hardship and the temptations of the devil. He explains that paradise is called the 'house of peace' as angels greet all those who enter with the word '*salām*' and people also use this salutation when they greet one another, as Surah (13: 23-24) and SurahYunus (10:10) record:

> And angels shall enter unto them from every gate (saying): '*Salamun 'Alaikum* (peace be upon you) for that you persevered in patience! Excellent indeed is the final home!' (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)
>
> Their prayer in them will be, 'Glory be to You, God!' their greeting, 'Peace', and the last part of their prayer, 'Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds'. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004).

Evaluation of the translations

Although Al-Hilali and Khan have transferred the implicit meaning of the collocation informatively, they should have placed the addition in a footnote rather than using a long explanatory note inserted into the text, as this breaks up the sentence and does not read well, disrupting comprehension. However, they have managed to transfer the intended meaning ('paradise') into the target language, as well as the conditions for accepting acts of worship. As such, they have grasped the intention of the original text and rendered the whole message using explanatory note within free translation method, and therefore this strategy can convey the intended meaning and make the message accessable and intellegible to the target audienc. Understanding the context of the source text can assist in decoding its implicit meaning, and this helps the translator to choose the appropriate translation strategies. As Nida (2001, 35) demonstrates, 'the context not only determines how a word is to be understood, but also how it is to be translated'.

Ali, meanwhile, uses a calque translation for this collocation, followed by a semantic translation with a footnote explaining that although life is fleeting with no real pleasure, Allah calls the righteous to a higher life (to the 'Home of Peace') where there is true enjoyment and neither sadness nor fear. However, it appears that Ali's translation does not convey the implicit message, which refers to paradise, as his explanation could be understood instead as an invitation to be pious. Pickthall uses a literal translation, 'the abode of peace', which potentially obscures the implicit meaning. The target reader may find the phrase ambiguous and raise the question, 'which home?' As such, Pickthall's translation does not necessarily convey the underlying message. As the connotative meaning of the word '*salām*' in Arabic in this context differs from the connotative meanings of the word 'peace' in English, transferring the content of the collocation into English is more effective than a word-for-word translation.

12. '*Sirājan wahhāja*' (N+Adj)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

wa-jaʿalnā sirājan wahhāja (Surah An-Naba [The Tiding] 78: 13)

And have appointed a dazzling lamp (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

And have made (therein) a shining lamp (sun) (Al-Hilali and Khan: 1974: 1996).

And placed (therein) a Light of Splendour? (Ali, 1934: 1975).

Semantic analysis

According to Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987, 341) and Al-Damaghany (1983, 275), '*sirājan wahhājan'* (literally, 'a shining lamp') in this verse refers to the sun. However, Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987, 341) defines 'lamp' as a general word for light, which is often used as a metaphor for mental illumination, as in 'seeing the light'. DAEQU (2008, 430, 1050) defines the word '*sirājan*' as a lantern or lamp, commenting that some philologists claim that its origins lie in the Persian language and noting that it occurs four times in the Quran. The dictionary refers to Surah 71: 16, 'He set the moon in them for a light and He set the sun for a lamp', as an example. Meanwhile, it comments that '*wahhājan*', meaning 'blazing', 'glimmering', 'glaring' and 'shining', occurs only once in the Quran, in Surah 78: 13, and is translated thus: 'We installed a blazing lamp (in the heavens).'

Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 394), Al-Tabari 1997, 7: 514) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 22: 8) all regard a dazzling or shining lamp as a metaphor for the sun. Ibn Kathir reports that this refers to the radiance of the sun which spreads light across the world, shining on everyone on earth. He adds that the verb '*waja'alna*' literally means 'to make' but, in this context, it means 'to create' – an example of the way that an understanding of Arabic grammar and vocabulary can help the translator convey the intended meaning of a verse. Al-Razi (1995, 16: 9) indicates that Arab linguists are divided about the meaning of '*wah hājan*'. Some say it denotes a source of light and heat, and affirm that Allah has clarified that the sun is the source of the highest level of light and heat: thus, it is '*wahhājan*' (shining or dazzling). Al-Rāzī also states that, according to the book of Al-Khalil, the adjectives 'shining' and 'dazzling' refer to heat from a fire as well as the heat of the sun.

Evaluation of the translations

Pickthall translates this collocation literally as 'a dazzling lamp', the underlying meaning of which – the sun – may not be detected by the target audience. Phrases such as 'a shining lamp' or 'a dazzling lamp' may also hold different connotations for different readers. For example, in the New Testament, a similar phrase is used to describe the prophet John (John 5: 35), and in the Quran (Surah 33: 45-46), the phrase 'an illuminated lamp' is used to refer to the Prophet Mohammed. Therefore, it may be difficult to grasp the metaphorical meaning of this phrase due to cultural differences between the Arabic-speaking and English-speaking worlds. In the Quran, for instance, there are many references to Allah as creator of the universe, and after reading a verse concerning the creation of the heavens, the earth and the mountains, Arab readers may naturally think of the moon and the sun. For example, in Surah 78: 12-13, Allah says: 'And We have built above you seven strong heavens, and have created a shining lamp (the sun)' (my translation). The collocation's textual context, which comprises its surrounding verses, may help Arabic speakers or those with a specialist knowledge of Islamic terms to identify the implicit meaning of '*sirājan wahhājan*', but it would be difficult for target readers to grasp. Translators need to be aware of the meaning of surrounding verses that could influence an understanding of the implicit meaning of the collocation, and should therefore avoid literal translation. As Nassimi (2008) asserts that if one studies and grasps the textual context of other verses around the verse, then the meaning will be very clear. Translators can use intertextual analysis to grasp the intended meaning of the verse in question – for example, Surah 10: 5 features the two words together: 'It is He who made the sun a shining radiance and the moon a light'(Abdel-Haleem:2004).

Unlike Pickthall, both the translations of Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali transfer the meaning of '*sirājan wahhājan*' appropriately by using free translation. They employ a calque technique followed by a paraphrase with the word 'sun' to elucidate the connotative meaning for their target readers. Ali adds a footnote referring to the correct meaning: namely, the sun. This is a further example of the fact that a free translation method is a more suitable approach when rendering the meaning of the metaphorical and ambiguous collocations in the Quranic text into another language, as this approach transfers the original content and uses useful strategies to render the message clearly to the audience such as footnote and calque followed by paraphrase as illustrated above.

13-14 '*Ṭarafayi n-nahāri*' (N+N) and '*Zulafan mina al-layli*' (N+P+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *wa-ʾaqimi ṣ-ṣalāta ṭarafayi n-nahāri wa-zulafan mina l-layli ʾinna l-ḥasanāti yudhhibna s-sayyiʾāti dhālika dhikrā li-dh-dhākirīn* (Surah Hud 11: 114)
>
> Establish worship at the two ends of the day and in some watches of the night. Lo! Good deeds annul ill-deeds. This is reminder for the mindful. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)
>
> And establish regular prayers at the two ends of the day and at the approaches of the night: For those things, that are good remove those that are evil: Be that the word of remembrance to those who remember (their Lord). (Ali, 1934: 1975)
>
> And perform *As-Salat* (*Iqamat-as-Salat*), at the two ends of the day and in some hours of the night [i.e. the five compulsory *Salat* (prayers)]. Verily, the good deeds remove the evil deeds (i.e. small sins). That is a reminder (an advice) for the mindful (those who accept advice). (Al-Hilali and Khan: 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

According to DAEQU (2008, 991, 401), the phrase '*waʾaqimi a ṣ-ṣalāta ṭarafayi an-nahāri*' (literally, 'perform *salāt* at the two ends of the day') means 'perform *ṣalāt* at the beginning and the end of the day' (i.e. morning and evening prayers), while the word '*zulfah*' means 'nearness', 'approaching' or 'being close'. In this verse, Surah Hud (11: 114), believers are commanded to perform their prayers regularly in the morning and in the evening, and at certain times during the night. Exegetes agree that the verse refers to performing the five compulsory prayers but there is disagreement over the exact meaning of '*ṭarafayi an-nahāri*'. Ibn Kathir (1997, 2: 396-97), Al-Tabari (1997, 4: 409-10) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 11: 227-32) each relate that some of the Prophet's followers say this phrase refers to '*fajr*' (dawn) and '*maghrib*' (sunset) prayers, while others such as Mujāhd say it refers to '*dhuhr*' (midday) and '*asr*' (afternoon) prayers. Al-Tabari (1997) supports the views of Ibn Abbas (618-687), Al-Hasan (1493-1545) and Ibn Zayd (690-753) , who argue that the reference to prayers at the beginning and end of the day means praying in the '*subh*' (morning) – that is, is before sunrise, specifically at dawn or the start of the day – and at '*maghrib*' (sunset) – that is, after sunset, the end of the day.

In their explanation of the second collocation in this verse, the same exegetes, Ibn Khathir (1997),Al-Tabari (1997) and Al-Qurtubi (2006), report that Al-Hasan (1493-1545), Qatādah (680-736) and Al-ḍahhak (660-725) state that the collocation '*wa zulafan mina al-layli*' implies night prayers – namely, prayers performed at *maghrib* (sunset) and *isha* (night) – explaining that the word '*zulfah*' means 'times close to each other'. Al-Qurṭubī adds that others claim that '*zulfah*' implies *maghrib* (sunset), *isha* (night) and *fajr* (morning) prayers. The exegetes conclude that together these two collocations refer to Islam's five obligatory prayers. They cite a hadith by Al-Bukhari (526: 4687) and Muslim (2763), clarifying the reasons for the revelation of this verse as follows:

> A man came to the Prophet Mohammed and told him that he did everything to a woman who was not his wife except the actual act of sexual intercourse. The Prophet Mohammed narrated this verse for the first time to him meaning that maintaining prayers regularly would be good deeds that would wipe away the evil deeds. (Al-Bukhari and Muslim)

There are few examples in the Quran of this type of collocation in which two separate collocations create a single meaning: for example, '*ṭarafayi an-nahāri wa zulafan mina al-layli*' refers to praying at the two ends of the day (two or three prayers) and during certain hours of the night (two or three prayers), adding up to the five obligatory prayers. There is another verse in Surah 17: 78, which is similar to this verse in terms of meaning:

> Perform *As-Salāt* (*Iqamat-as-Salat*) from mid-day till the darkness of the night (i.e. the *Zuhr,* '*Asr, Maghrib*', and '*Isha*' prayers), and recite the Qur'an in the early dawn (i.e. the Morning Prayer). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Evaluation of the translations

Turning to an analysis of the translations, Pickthall's literal rendering 'at the two ends of the day' does not appear to clearly imply the five prayers that target readers might associate with Islamic religious duty. Even native speakers of Arabic would not necessarily be able to grasp the meaning of these collocations as a reference to five prayers, unless they were specialists in Quranic Arabic. Both Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali, on the other hand, choose to render the collocations using a free translation method. The former translators paraphrase the meaning in relation to the context (i.e. performing five compulsory prayers), while Ali supplements his

translation with an explanatory footnote which relays the meaning as it is found in various exegetical works. Free translation concentrates on the content and sometimes uses more information in the target language and different strategies such as paraphrase and footnote to convey the message informatively. In cases such as this, the exegetical materials are particularly useful in helping decipher the intended meanings of the Quranic collocations. Abdel-Raof (2001, 30) maintains that 'translating the Quran, therefore, requires a thorough exegetical analysis and reference to exegetical works otherwise the meaning of the Quran will be distorted and drastically mispresented in the target language'.

15. *A-s-sābiqūna s-sābiqūn* (N+N [subject+predicate])

The Quranic collocation and its translations

wa-s-sābiqūna s-sābiqūn (Surah Al-Waqi'ah [The Inevitable] 56: 10)

And the foremost in the race, the foremost in the race (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

And those foremost (in Islamic Faith of Monotheism and in performing righteous deeds) in the life of this world on the very first call (to embrace Islam), will be foremost (in Paradise). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

And those Foremost (in Faith) will be Foremost (in the Hereafter) (Ali, 1934: 1975)

Semantic analysis

This collocation consists of a repetition of the same lexical item, '*wa-s-sābiqūna s-sābiqūn'*. This form is generally used for the purpose of confirmation, and to maintain the rhyme and aesthetic rhythm of the Quran. Therefore, this third type of collocation could be added to the classification of *ʾittibāʾ* (literally, to follow) drawn up by Ibn Faris (cited in El-Gemei, 2006, 345). However, there is an important difference in that this *ʾittibā* includes a connotative meaning while Ibn Faris's other two types do not: the first, a lexical item, is followed by a meaningful lexical item from the same root but a different system – for example: '*laylun la' īl*' (literally, 'nighting night') – while the second type of '*ʾittibā*'' has a second lexical item that is there purely for rhyming (therefore, aesthetic) purposes and adds no meaning – for example, *'shaiṭānun layṭān'* ('devilish Satan') (see chapter 4).

According to DCAL (2008: 1029), in Surah Al-Waqi'ah (56: 10) above, the phrase implies those who precede others in enacting righteous deeds, while DAEQU (2008, 419) states that '*as-sābiq*' (the singular form of '*as-sābiqūn*') means one who is in the lead or gets ahead of others in a race, outstripping them. Al-Tabari (1997, 7: 195), Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 240-41) and Al-Qurtubi (2015, 20: 182-83) all interpret the preceding verses (56: 7, 8, 9) as meaning that Allah will divide all nations into three groups in the hereafter. The first group, who are given their records in their right hand, will enter paradise; those in the second group will be given their records in their left hand and will enter hell. The verse also refers to a third group: those who are foremost in performing righteous deeds and will therefore be foremost in paradise. Ibn Kathir (1997) notes that this triple division is also mentioned in Surah Fatir (35: 32):

> *fa-minhum ẓālimun li-nafsihī wa-minhum muqtaṣidun wa-minhum sābiqun bi-l-khayrāti bi-ʾidhni llāhi dhālika huwa l-faḍlu l-kabīr*
>
> Some of them wronged their own souls, some stayed between (right and wrong), and some, by God's leave, were foremost in good deeds. (Abdel-Haleem, 2004)

Al-Tabari (1997), however, reports that the Quranic exegetes hold different opinions on the meaning of the phrase '*wa-s-sābiqūna s-sābiqūn'*. Some believe that '*sābiqūn*' refers to those who pray facing in the direction of the two Qiblas: according to Ibn Sirin, people initially prayed facing towards Jerusalem, but later the direction was moved and they then faced toward Al-Mesjed Al-Haram in Mecca. Others argue, however, that it is a reference to those who are the foremost in performing *jihād* and attending mosque. Al-Razi (1995, 15: 146-47) considers this to be a one-statement sentence, similar to saying, 'you, you', for emphasis. He argues that the repetition of '*as-sābiqūn*' in this case means that those who are foremost in life, in terms of piety, will be foremost in paradise.

Evaluation of the translations

Pickthall renders the collocation '*wa as-sābiqūna as-sābiqūna*' literally, adding the word 'race', which could prove extremely confusing to target readers who would not be able to grasp the intended meaning, because, as Nida and Taber (1982, 16) rightly observe,'a literal rendering is both unnatural and misleading'. Translators need to preserve the function and effect of the Quranic discourse in order to convey what exegetes have determined is the

intended meaning: those who are foremost in faith and in righteous deeds. Unlike Pickthall, Ali renders the collocation using a free translation method which involves adding the explanatory parenthetical phrases 'in Faith' and 'in the Hereafter', elucidating the implied meaning of this collocation to his readership. However, Al-Hilali's and Khan's free translation, using an informative explanatory note and paraphrasing, is the most accurate of the three in that it conveys the full implicit meaning, particulary as these authors specify the kind of faith (Islamic Monotheism) practised by these people, implying that each righteous deed is done for the sake of Allah, and that this is an essential condition of worship. Explanatory note and paraphrase strategies of free translation help to render the message obviously to the target language.

16. '*Thāniyaʿiṯfihī*' (V+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *thāniya ʿiṯfihī li-yuḍilla ʿan sabīli llāhi lahū fī d-dunyā khizyun wa-nudhīquhū yawma l-qiyāmati ʿadhāba l-ḥarīq* (surah Al-Hajj: 9) (22:9)
>
> (Disdainfully) bending his side, in order to lead (men) astray from the Path of Allah: For him there is disgrace in this life, and on the Day of Judgment We shall make him taste the Penalty of burning (Fire). (Ali, 1934: 1975)
>
> Turning away in pride to beguile (men) from the way of Allah. For him in this world is ignominy, and on the Day of Resurrection We make him taste the doom of burning. (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)
>
> Bending his neck in pride (far astray from the Path of Allah), and leading (others) too (far) astray from the Path of Allah. For him there is disgrace in this worldly life, and on the Day of Resurrection We shall make him taste the torment of burning (Fire). (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

Al-Damaghany (1983, 152) asserts that '*thāniyaʿiṯfihī*' means 'to twist the neck as an act of arrogance' and the word '*thāniy'* includes four different interpretations in the Quran. DAEQU (2008, 627) confirms that the literal meaning of this collocation is twisting the body or turning away, and this phrase carries the implied sense of acting arrogantly. However,

'thāniya' has four different meanings in the Quran: for example, in addition to 'arrogant', when it appears within the word '*almathānī*', it can mean 'the first seven surahs' or it can refer to Surah Al-Fatiha. However, there is no agreement among the exegetes about the meaning of '*almatānī*' as it occurs in Surah Al-Hajer (15: 87): 'We have given you [i.e. the Prophet Mohammed] seven of Al-Matani and the great Quran' (my translation). In fact the word '*ʿitfihī'* is a classical Arabic word, the meaning of which remains obscure, and even native Arabic speakers struggle to understand it without checking its meaning in exegetic books or certain types of Arabic dictionaries. Therefore, in this verse, '*thāniya ʿitfihī*' is likely to carry further implications, and phrases such as 'turning away' or 'bending his side/neck' literally may fail to convey these implications to the target readers. Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 186), Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 408-409) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 14: 327-28) all interpret '*thāniya ʿitfihī*' as meaning to turn away from the truth (i.e. the path of Allah), thus displaying arrogance; the verse proclaims that such people will be cursed in this world and experience the fires of hell in the hereafter.

Evaluation of the translations

Both Ali and Pickthall render the collocation '*thāniya ʿitfihi*' literally, without referring to the implied meaning: '(Disdainfully) bending his side, in order to lead (men) astray from the Path of Allah' (Ali) and 'Turning away in pride to beguile (men) from the way of Allah' (Pickthall). The idea of someone 'bending his side' or 'turning away in pride' in order to lead people astray lacks coherence and is confusing. As Dickins et al. (2002, 97) warn when commenting on the use of literal translation, 'in translation, lexical loss is very common, but it is just one kind of translation loss among many. It can occur for all sorts of reasons. It very often arises from the fact that exact synonymy between SL words and TL words is relatively rare.' Al-Hilali and Khan, on the other hand, translate the whole verse appropriately for the needs of their readership. They show that they have grasped the implied meaning of the collocation, '*thāniya ʿitfihi*', by adding the phrase 'far astray from the Path of Allah', and use a suitable connector 'and leading (others)' to preserve the overall meaning. Free translation tends to produce the same message of the original text without any constraints and sometimes adds more information in the target language and uses strategies such as paraphrase and explanatory notes.

17. '*Fī ẓulumātin thalāthin*' (P+N+N) (propositional Collocation)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

yakhluqukum fī buṭūniʾummahātikum khalqan min baʿdi khalqin fī ẓulumātin thalāthin dhālikumu llāhu rabbukum lahu l-mulku lā ʾilāha ʾillā huwa fa-ʾannā tuṣrafūn (surah Az-Zumar: 6) (39:6)

He creates you in the wombs of your mothers, creation after creation <u>in three veils of darkness</u>, such is Allah your Lord. His is the kingdom, *La ilaha illa Huwa* (none has the right to be worshipped but He). How then are you turned away? (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996).

He created you in the wombs of your mothers, creation after creation, <u>in a threefold gloom.</u> Such is Allah, your Lord. His is the Sovereignty. There is no God save Him. How then are ye turned away? (Pickthall, 1930: 1938).

He makes you, in the wombs of your mothers, in stages, one after another, <u>in three veils of darkness</u>. Such is God, your Lord and Cherisher: to Him belongs (all) dominion. There is no god but He: then how are ye turned away (from your true Centre)? (Ali, 1934: 1975).

Semantic analysis

According to Ibn Al-Jawzy (1987, 424), the principal meaning of '*ẓalām*' is darkness (literally, the 'blackness of night'). He notes that exegetes assert that this word has two additional meanings in the Quran: disbelief ('*shirk*') and horror. He refers to Surah Al-Anbiya (21: 87): 'He [Jonah] cried out through the darkness' (my translation). After being swallowed by the whale, Jonah prayed to Allah to save him. In this context, the darkness is that of the night, the water and the belly of the whale. However, DAEQU (2008, 587) identifies the darkness referred to in this verse in terms of degrees, layers or folds, speaking of 'three layers of darkness'. This type of semantic translation does not specify the kinds of layers involved. Al-Damaghany (1983, 327), meanwhile, states that in the case of '*fī ẓulumātin thalāthin*' the darkness is that which envelops the unborn child: the darkness of the caul (the amniotic membrane that surrounds the foetus), the darkness of the mother's womb and the darkness inside her belly. Similarly, Ibn Kathir (1997, 4: 41), Al-Tabari (1997, 6: 426)

and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 18: 250) argue that, according to Ibn Abbas (618-687), ʿAkremah (646-723), Mujahid (642-722), Qatadah (680-736), Ibn Zayd (690-753)and Al-Dahhak (660-725) , this verse refers to the stages of a baby's development over the course of the mother's pregnancy, and therefore '*fī ẓulumātin thalāthin*' implies the darkness of the caul, the mother's womb and her belly (as Al-Damaghany states, above). Al-Razi (1995, 13: 46) concurs, saying that it speaks of the darkness of the '*sulb*' (the caul), the womb and the belly.

Evaluation of the translations

Al-Hilali's and Khan's semantic translation of this collocation as 'in three veils of darkness' fails to convey the intended meaning of this collocation fully. This is also the case with Pickthall's phrase of literal translation, 'in a threefold gloom'. These translators appear to have decided that no further explanation is necessary; however, the literal translation has no equivalence in the target language. As Nida and Taber state:

> Since words cover areas of meaning and are not mere points of meaning, and since in different languages the semantic areas of corresponding words are not identical, it is inevitable that the choice of the right word in the receptor language to translate a word in the source-language text depends more on the context than upon a fixed system of verbal consistency. (Nida and Taber, 1982, 15)

Ali, however, appears to have concluded that a translation of the phrase alone would not be sufficient for target-language readers and he therefore opts to supplement his rendition with an explanatory footnote, which draws on the interpretations of the best-known exegetical works to explain the collocation's specific meaning in this context,. Ali's free translation allows him to use a footnote strategy explains clealy the implicit meaning of the collocation.

18. '*Qurrata ʾaʿyunin*' (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *wa-lladhīna yaqūlūna rabbanā hab lanā min ʾazwājinā wa-dhurriyyātinā qurrata ʾaʿyunin wa-jʿalnā li-l-muttaqīna ʾimāma* (Surah Al-Furqan [The Criterion] 25: 74)
>
> And who say: Our Lord! Vouchsafe us comfort of our wives and of our offspring, and make us patterns for (all) those who ward off (evil). (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)

And those who pray, 'Our Lord! Grant unto us wives and offspring who will be the comfort of our eyes, and give us (the grace) to lead the righteous'. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

And those who say: 'Our Lord! Bestow on us from our wives and our offspring who will be the comfort of our eyes, and make us leaders for the *Muttaqun*' (pious – see V.2:2)'. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

According to DCAL (2008, 1794), the phrase '*qurrat ʾaʿyun*' (literally, 'his eyes have been comforted') carries the metaphorical meaning of feeling happiness or delight, and comments that it is commonly held that tears of happiness are cold while those of sorrow are hot. Meanwhile, DAEQU (2008, 751) notes this phrase literally means 'rest for our eyes' but can refer to comfort, pleasure, happiness or consolation.

Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 291-92), Al-Tabarī (1997, 5: 634) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 15: 488-89) argue that '*qurrataʾaʿyunin*' means that those who ask Allah to grant them wives and offspring who worship Him faitfully, and not associating any others in worship with Him. Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 291-292) cites Ibn Abbas (618-687) who states that if wives and sons obey Allah sincerely, they will bring peace of mind and happiness to their husbands and parents in this world and in the hereafter ('*qurrataʾaʿyun*'). A literal translation of this culturally specific collocation will not convey its metaphorical meaning to target readers. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 15: 488-89) explains the collocation as meaning that those who have been blessed by Allah with offspring who are pious will experience '*qurrataʾaʿyunin*'; in other words, a peaceful family life, with family members cooperating with each other in performing their religious and worldly duties. He goes on to comment that such a man is never tempted to look at another's wife or offspring with envy, and his eyes are 'calm' (i.e. he is not restless). This, Al-Qurtubi claims, is the original meaning of '*qurrata ʾaʿyun*' – a feeling of serenity. He further explains that the collocation '*qurrata ʾaʿyun*' is derived from the term '*al-qarar*' (comfort) or '*al-qur*' (coldness), since tears of happiness are deemed to be cold while tears of sorrow are thought of as hot. Al-Razi (1995, 12: 115-16) also reports that '*qurrataʾaʿyun*' could refer to those who ask Allah if their sons and wives can join them in paradise in order to bring them pleasure and happiness.

Evaluation of the translations

The three translations all offer a literal rendition of this collocation, using the term 'the comfort of our eyes' and 'comfort of our wives and of our offspring'without referring to the intended meaning. Such a translation could prove an obstacle to target-language readers who would not understand the implied meaning of the collocation. The word '*qurra*' is a classical Arabic term that is mainly used in Islamic religious texts, including the Quran and the hadiths of the Prophet Mohammed, but also in classical and modern poetry. Therefore, if the target readers are not supplied with an approximation of the collocation's meaning, they will be unable to contextualise it, and the phrase 'comfort of our eyes' will sound alien, as '*qurrata ʾaʿyun*' has no direct equivalent in English. A literal translation cannot deal with SL words that have no equivalents in the TL, and therefore this approach does not serve the purpose and in fact obscures the implicit message of the verse. Rather free translation method is more suitable in this case as the translator can change and add information inorder to preserve approximate meaning and uses different strategies. Baker (2011, 60) observes that 'the nearst acceptable collocation in the target language will often involve some change in meaning. This change in meaning may be minimal, or not partcilularly significant in a given context. On the other hand, it maybe significant'.

19. '*Banī ʾisrāʾīla*' (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *yā-banī ʾisrāʾīla dhkurū niʿmatiya llatī ʾanʿamtu ʿalaykum wa-ʾawfū bi-ʿahdī ʾūfi bi-ʿahdikum wa-ʾiyyāya fa-rhabūn* (Surah Al-Baqarah [The Cow] 2: 40)
>
> O Children of Israel! Remember My Favour which I bestowed upon you, and fulfill (your obligations to) My Covenant (with you) so that I fulfill (My Obligations to) your covenant (with Me), and fear none but Me. (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974:1996)
>
> O Children of Israel! Remember My favour wherewith I favoured you, and fulfil your (part of the) covenant, I shall fulfil My (part of the) covenant, and fear Me.(Pickthall,1930:1938)
>
> O Children of Israel! Call to mind the (special) favour which I bestowed upon you, and fulfil your covenant with Me as I fulfil My Covenant with you, and fear none but Me. (1934:1975)

Semantic analysis

The collocation '*banī ʾisrāʾīla*' (literally, 'children of Israel') is used to refer to the Jewish people. Allah revealed the Quran in the language of the Quraysh tribe so that they could understand its meaning, and this term was in common use in their society even before the advent of Islam. Arab tribes were named after their founding ancestor: thus, the Prophet Mohammed's tribe was called 'the children of Hashem'. '*Banī*' is a classical Arabic term which is still in use today; however, it is translated as the modern word 'children' instead of '*banī*', tribe. According to DAEQU (2008, 115), '*banī ʾisrāʾīla*' is a proper name in Hebrew, and it occurs forty-three times in the Quran, meaning 'Children of Israel' and 'the Jewish people'. Ibn Kathir (1997), Al-Tabari (1997, 1: 201-202) and Al-Qurtubi (2006) claim that this verse addresses the Jews of Medina, whose patriarch was Jacob, later known as Israel (Genesis 32: 28 and 35: 10), reminding them of the favours that God had conferred upon them. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 2: 5-7),) also reports that Ibn Abbas asserts that '*Isra*' in Hebrew means 'slave' and '*el*' means Allah, and that this was the name given to Jacob as 'a slave of Allah'. Al-Qurtubi interprets this as meaning that Allah commanded the Jewish people to convert to Islam and follow the Prophet Mohammed. Ibn Kathir (1997, 1: 88) further explains that Allah chose the term, '*banī ʾisrāʾīla*', in this verse to remind the Jewish people of their father Jacob. He describes the verse as meaning 'O children of the pious, righteous servant of Allah who obeyed Allah, be like your father', a statement similar to saying 'O you son of a generous man, act in the same way as your father would' or 'O son of a brave man, fight the enemy (as your father would have)'. Ibn Kathīr further reports that Al-Ṭialisi cites Ibn Abbas as relating that 'A group of Jews came to the Prophet Mohammed and he said to them: Do you know that Israel means Jacob? They answered yes. The prophet replied: O Allah be witness.' Hence, Ibn Kathīr comments that this is evidence that the word 'Israel' refers to Jacob.

Evaluation of the translation

The authors of the three translations (Pickthall, Ali, and Al-Hilali and Khan) all render the term 'Children of Israel' literally, and this approach potentially obscures the implicit meaning of the collocation, which is that Allah is addressing 'the Jewish people', including Joseph,

Benjamin and other biblical figures, and reminding of them of His favours. The term 'Children of Israel' is well-known to those who read translations of the Old Testament; however, it may not necessarily be so familiar to modern-day readers, who may only be conversant with the New Testament, and some may not be familiar with the Bible at all.Therefore, a translator needs to take into consideration those target readers who do not have a biblical background and use a free translation and a paraphrase or explanatory strategies that clarifies the meaning, explaining that it refers to the Jewish nation, and perhaps elucidating the original meaning of the word 'Israel' in this context in a footnote. As Abdul-Raof (2004, 93) asserts:

> Arabic and English are linguistically and culturally incongruous languages; and a literal translation of a text like the Quran easily leads either to ambiguity, skewing of the source text intentionally, or inaccuracy in rendering the source message to the TL [target-language] reader. (Abdul-Raof, 2004, 93)

20. '*Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja'* (N+N)

The Quranic collocation and its translations

> *qālū yā-dhā l-qarnayni ʾinna yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja mufsidūna fī l-ʾarḍi fa-hal najʿalu laka kharjan ʿalā ʾan tajʿala baynanā wa-baynahum sadda* (Surah Al-Kahef 18: 94)
>
> They said: O Dhu'l-Qarneyn! Lo! Gog and Magog are spoiling the land. So may we pay thee tribute on condition that thou set a barrier between us and them? (Pickthall, 1930: 1938)
>
> They said: 'O Zul-qarnain! The Gog and Magog (People) do great mischief on earth: Shall we then render thee Tribute in order that Thou mightest erect a barrier Between us and them?' (Ali, 1934: 1975)
>
> They said: 'O Dhul-Qarnain! Verily! Ya'juj and Ma'juj (Gog and Magog) are doing great mischief in the land. Shall we then pay you a tribute in order that you might erect a barrier between us and them?' (Al-Hilali and Khan, 1974: 1996)

Semantic analysis

According to DCAL (2008, 2059 and 2505), Gog and Magog were two savage tribes, whose ancestors were thought to be the progeny of Yaft, the son of the prophet Noah. DAEQU

(2008, 864) states that many modern commentators believe they were tribes who originated in central Asia. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13: 378) also calls Gog and Mogag descendants of Yaft. He reports that Abu-Hurirah claimed that Mohammed said: 'Sam and Ham and Yaft are the sons of Noah, peace be upon him. Arabs and Persians and Romans are sons of Ham, whereas Gog and Mogag and Turks and Ṣaqāliba are sons of Yaft, whilst Copts and Berbers and Sudan [ese] are sons of Ham'.

Referring to Surah Al-Kahef 18: 94, Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 91-94) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13: 365-74) speak of Gog and Magog in relation to Dul-Qarnin (a man with two horns), whom they describe as a wise king, with a great army of powerful and well-armed warriors. Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 91) states that disbelievers of Meccah sent a group to people of the scripture asking them for some information with which they may test the Prophet Mohammed. The people of the scripture said: 'Ask him about a man who travelled tremendously around the world. However, Ibn Kathir does not believe in reliability of the news of Isra'iliyyat which state that the Prophet Muhammed answered that Dul-Qarnin was Alexander the Great, and built Alexanderia. He was raised to heavens by an angel and then taken to the dam. According to the Hebrew Bible, Dul-Qarnīn was Alexander the Great, he was a legend and built gates of Alexander (dam) to repel the tribe (Gog and Magog). However, the Quran does not mention who he is exactly, it only shows that he is a great righteous ruler. More difference is that the term (Gog and Magog) appears in the bible whereas in the Quran appears as '*Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*'. Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 91-94) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13: 365-74) relate that Allah allowed Dul-Qarnin to subdue the powers of nature and use them to his advantage to dominate both east and west. Ibn Kathir and Al-Qurtubi elaborate further that Dul-Qarnin travelled extensively, calling on all peoples to worship Allah, and all nations – not only Arabs but also non-Arabs – served him, and their kings submitted to him. Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13:164) and Al-Razi (1995, 11: 164) assert that there is disagreement about his identification and some state that he is Alexander, the Greek King, who built Alexanderia in Egypt. Ibn Kathir (1997, 3: 91-94) and Al-Qurtubi (2006, 13: 365-74) also relate that when Dul-Qarnin reached the space between two mountains through which the tribes of Gog and Magog frequently entered the land of the Turks, laying waste to crops and wounding people, he built a dam to prevent future raids. Al-Razi (1995, 11: 171-73) asserts that the mountains were either located between Armenia and Azerbaijan or in Turkey. He also declares that '*Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*' are names that are foreign to the Arabic tongue and there is disagreement about their provenance, with some saying they were Turks. He adds

that there is also little agreement as to their appearance: they were variously described as either very small or tall, with huge bodies and claws, and possessing teeth that resembled those of predatory animals. They were also reputed by some to eat people, while others stated that they used to make incursions into the neighbouring territory in the spring in order to steal the crops. However, Al-Tabari (1997, 5: 201-202), in constrast, believes that Gog and Mogag were simply two nations who lived behind the mountains in that region, and there is no evidence to show that they ravaged the surrounding land prior to the construction of Dul-Qarnīn's dam.

Evaluation of the translations

As the exegetes above explain, the collocation '*Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*' are the names of two tribes, described as descendants of Yaft, the son of Noah, which were reputed to regularly devastate their neighbouring lands. The Quran sometimes refers to such parables and historical stories without giving any background information, thus a literal translation of this collocation could baffle target readers. Pickthall renders the phrase as 'Gog and Mogag' without informing the reader who these peoples are. Although Surah Al-Kahf gives a little information about Dul-Qarnin in verse 83, the target readers would not necessarily realise who Gog and Mogag are. Therefore, Pickthall's literal translation does not seem appropriate here, and could cause confusion. He should have provided some background information about the place of Gog and Mogag in Islamic tradition, informing the reader about their association with the story of Dul-Qarnin. In contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali offer informative translations of this collocation. Ali uses a free translation, paraphrasing the names of Gog and Magog with the word 'people', followed by a footnote clarifying the event in which they appear in the historical story. This reads as follows:

> The conquerer [Dul-Qarnīn] had now arrived among a people who were different in speech and race from him, but not quite primitive, for they were skilled in the working of metals, and could furnish blocks (or bricks) of iron, melt metals with bellows or blow-pipes, and prepare molten lead (xviii: 96). Apparently, they were a peaceable and industrious race, much subject to incursions from wild tribes who are called Gog and Magog. Against these tribes, they were willing to purchase immunity by paying the conqueror tribute in return for protection. The permanent protection they wanted was the closing of a mountain gap through which the incursions were made. Dul-Qarnain [*sic*] refused to impose a tribute on this weak tribe and agreed to do what they requested. (Ali, 1934: 1975)

This illustrates how a long, additional, exegetical footnote is sometimes inevitable if the translator is to convey the message clearly to the target readership.

Al-Hilali and Khan, meanwhile, use also a free translation and apply useful strategies such as a cultural borrowing and calque translation of 'Gog and Mogag', followed by a footnote referring the reader to the *tafsīr* of Al-Qurtubi for further information. In addition, the footnote includes the hadith of the Prophet Mohammed, cited in Al-Bukhari (9: 249), in which his wife, Zienab, relates that:

> One day the Prophet Mohamed entered upon me and he was very scared and said none has the right to be worshipped but Allah! Woe to the Arabs from the great evils that has approached them. The hole has been opened in the dam of Ya'juj and Ma'juj, and Zīnab asked the Prophet: Shall we be destroyed if they still be righteous people among us? The Prophet replied: Yes, if the evil people have been increased.

In general, it is Ali's translation that is the more accurate, in that it provides sufficient information about Gog and Mogag. Therefore, when there are cultural differences between the source and target languages, or the text contains obscure words, the translator needs to add enough information to elucidate the intended message for their target readership. As Newmark maintains:

> The additional information a translator may have to add to his version is normally cultural (accounting for difference between SL and TL culture), technical (relating to the topic) or linguistic (explaining wayward use of words), and is dependent on the requirement of his, as opposed to the original, readership. (Newmark, 1995, 91)

6.4 Strategies and procedures employed by the selected translators

The study chose twenty examples of collocations with a culturally specific and metaphorical sense that have been rendered into English by the authors of the three works of translation selected for the analyis. The table (below) shows that the translators, in most cases, failed to capture the collocation's intended meaning, a fact that is underlined by the exegetical works consulted during the course of this research. In relation to this, it appears that none of the translators adopted a predominant procedure when translating these phrases but mainly used a mixture of different strategies.

Collocations	**Pickthall**	**Ali**	**Al-Hilali and Khan**
(1) *al-bayti al-ʿatīq*	literal	literal	free
(2) *ahl al-kitāb*	semantic	literal	free
(3) *qawlan thaqīlan*	literal	free	free
(4) *wa yuqīmūna aṣ-ṣalāta*	literal	semantic	Free
(5) *waʿātū z-zakāta*	free	semantic	literal
(6) *lyaqḍū tafathahum*	literal	free	free
(7) *dhikrun mubārakun*	literal	modified literal	free
(8) *abyaḍḍat wujūhuhum*	literal	literal	literal
(9) *raḥmati allahi*	literal	semantic	free
(10) *aṣ-ṣummu al-bukmu*	literal	free	free
(11) *dāri s-salām*	literal	semantic	free
(12) *sirājan wahhājan*	literal	free	free
(13) *ṭarafayi an-nahāri*	literal	literal	free
and zulafan mina al-layli	literal	free	free
(14)*as-sābiqūna as-sābiqūna*	literal	free	free
(15) *thāniya ʾiṯfihī*	literal	literal	free
(16) *fī ẓulumātin thalāthin*	literal	free	semantic
(17) *qurrata ʾaʾyunin*	literal	literal	literal
(19) *banī ʾisrāʾīla*	literal	literal	literal
(20) *yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*	literal	free	free

Table 7.1: Examples of collocations

The analysis of sample (7) in Surah (21:5) (see the table, above),'*dhikrun mubārakun*', reveals that Al-Hilali and Khan render the collocation suitably in English, using a free translation method which transfers the implicit meaning, 'a blessed Reminder' (i.e. the Quran), successfully. By contrast, Pickhall and Ali render the collocation literally. As was noted in this Chapter (p.169), a knowledge of the syntactical and grammatical structure of this verse could help the translator discern the intended meaning of the collocation, particularly as the verse shifts from past to present: at the beginning, Allah is referring to the Torah, but later He is referring to the Quran, using the connector 'and' followed by a demonstrative pronoun 'this', as in 'and this is a blessed Reminder'. Therefore, translators need to be aware of the Arabic syntax and grammar of the Quran if they wish to grasp the intended meaning of such collocations. As Abdel-Raof (2001, 2) stresses, 'the Quran translator does not only need a sound linguistic competence in both Arabic and English, but also an advanced knowledge in Arabic syntax and rhetoric in order to appreciate the complex linguistic and rhetorical patterns of Quranic structures'.

The analysis of sample (8) in Surah (22: 29) shows that none of the selected translators appear to grasp the contextual meaning of the collocation '*abyaḍḍat wujūhuhum',* and consequently they resort to using a literal translation, 'faces will become white', which obscures the meaning of the phrase. In most cases, the target readers would find it difficult to discern the implicit meaning of this collocation without an explanation, as the translation would sound culturally alien to them. This underlines the fact that translators of the Quran have to constantly bear in mind that they are not translating the text for Arabic speakers, who may sometimes understand the contextual background of the collocations: for example, as Al-Razi (1995) explains, a 'white face' is often used as a metaphor in some idiomatic expressions in Arabic. Furthermore, the exegeses of Ibn Kathir, Al-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi and Al-Razi explain the meaning of 'white' and 'black' faces as these appear in the Quran: the former indicates the delighted faces of those who realise they will be admitted to paradise because they obeyed Allah; the latter refers to the downcast faces of those who, due to their disobedience, are condemned to the punishment of hellfire. This shows why non-Arabic-speaking readers could find the literal translations of this collocation ambiguous and bemusing. By contrast, a free translation can transfer the implicit meaning of the source language in this example into the target language, with the help of any or some of the explicitation techniques cited above. Vinay and Darbelent (1995, 342) emphasise the use of

such strategies, which they define as ‘a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation’. These techniques can be used whenever there is an ambiguous expression in the source language that has no equivalent in the target language. Free translation method attempts to render the content and the message and can use as much information as are needed in an appropriate manner to the target audience regardless the form of the source text. Besides, different strategies can be used within free translation such as footnote, paraphrase, and explanatory note, descriptive and functional equivalence. Pratima Shastri (2012: 22) asserts that ‘free translation means liberty from the SL word for word but being faitful to the original meaning.’

The comparative analysis of sample (12), ‘*sirājan wahhājan*’, in Surah (78: 13), shows that Pickthall uses a literal translation, ‘a dazzling lamp’ that fails to convey the metaphorical meaning of the collocation, which refers to the sun. A literal translation does not pay attention to the implicit meaning of the phrase because it only focuses on the form of words used; therefore, adopting this method here could distort the meaning and confuse the target reader. In the verses that precede and follow this collocation, Allah describes his creation of the world, referring to the earth and its mountains, the seven heavens, and the rain that comes down from the clouds; from this it could be deduced that the term used in this verse indicates the sun. In some cases, therefore, the translator needs to consult the surrounding verses to grasp the implicit meaning of the collocation. If the verse contains a metaphor such as this, then it would be better to use a free translation technique in order to render its meaning accurately, as Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali do. The former authors use a paraphrase, placing the word ‘sun’ in brackets, and the latter uses a footnote to refer to it. A free translation approach allows a meaning-based rendition, and thus is more suitable for transferring the implicit or allegorical meanings found in the Quran.

The study also analysed sample (20), ‘*Yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*’, in Surah (18: 94). It noted that Pickthall translates this collocation literally as ‘Gog and Magog’. Without further explanation, this translation would be incomprehensible to anyone other than a specialist reader, as important information concerning this term is missing. Although Ali uses a free translation for this collocation, placing the word ‘people’ in parantheses, there is still a translation loss. However, he appears to realise this, and to reduce this risk, he adds a long footnote describing Gog and Magog (*yaʾjūja wa-maʾjūja*) and their historical context. In this case, Ali uses a compensation technique which is very informative, confirming the assertion

by Dickins et al. (2002, 40) that ‘compensation, in one or another of its many forms, is absolutely crucial to successful translation’. Meanwhile, Al-Hilali and Khan also use a free translation technique with a footnote referring to Gog and Magog, with the word ‘people’ in parentheses. They also reference Al-Qurtubi as a source of further information, as well as the hadith of the Prophet Mohammed as narrated by his wife, Zienab, where the Prophet speaks of how Gog and Magog have opened a breach in the dam, posing a danger to the Arab people. This translation, therefore, also approximates the meaning of the source language.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has analysed and compared three translations of each of the twenty culturally specific collocations selected from the Quran, all of which display differing grammatical patterns. It has shown that the phenomenon of Quranic collocations posed a severe challenge to the translators, a consequence of the deeper cultural meanings contained in these phrases, added to the complexity of the Arabic language as it is used in the Quran. The four works of exegesis and three dictionaries as well as two other relevant resources consulted for this comparative analysis have confirmed this observation.

Each of the three translators took a different approach and adopted different strategies when attempting to translate these culturally specific collocations. Pickthall mainly depends on a literal translation; he does not use other strategies or techniques, and due to this, his translations do not appear to convey the intended meaning of the collocations in an informative way to his readers. Ali, meanwhile, uses literal translation at times and semantic translation at others, and in one case, free translation. This means that his work also encounters problems, as it does not always convey the implicit meanings of the collocations. Although he uses strategies like calque, paraphrasing, additions and footnotes in those cases where he employs a semantic approach, these strategies do not appear as beneficial as they should in many cases because he fails to refer to the collocation’s exact contextual meaning. This means that his translation sometimes contains redundant information rather than an essential explanation. Al-Hilali’s and Khan’s work appears to focus mainly on free translation, although they use a literal translation for a few of the examples, which is problematic because, in these cases, their translations do not appear to convey the metaphorical and cultural meanings of the collocations. They also depend primarily on strategies like paraphrasing, footnotes and explanatory notes, and the latter, which are placed within the text, often appear redundant and do not read well, creating unwieldy sentences.

However, as these authors also adopt a technique of cultural borrowing and addition in order to impart the message contained in the text, their translation appears in the majority of cases to be the most informative of the three: they explain and clarify the intended meaning of the culturally specific collocations and refer to other useful resources.

The analysis in this chapter has shown, therefore, that a free-translation approach is more appropriate to rendering culturally specific collocations from Arabic into English, since this method can convey the message they contain more informatively to the target readers. It has revealed that, in some examples, translators have used literal translation, followed by free translation. This strategy is sometimes useful because, if a literal translation is used at the beginning of the translation, it helps raise the awareness of the readers of the language of the Quran; however, it is essential that this is followed by an explanation of the phrase, using different techniques such as paraphrasing or footnotes to deliver the full meaning. As the Arabic and English languages are so dissimilar, a translator has to sometimes change the structure of a sentence in order to render it comprehensible in translation. These examples reveal that it is imperative that he or she has a deep understanding of the language of the Quran, as invaluable information is embedded in its particular linguistic structure. The chapter has also shown that exegetical books are a vital tool for deciphering the intended meanings of the Quranic collocations.

The next chapter will discuss and comment on these analytical findings in more detail, highlighting the conclusions that can be drawn from the results of the research.

Chapter Seven
Discussion and Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

The preceding analysis of the translation into English of a number of selected Quranic collocations, each with a culturally specific and metaphorical meaning, has revealed that despite the wide range of specific strategies and procedures available to translators, a literal translation method has mostly been employed. The study argues that this method can obscure or deform the implicit meaning of a collocation, rendering it ambiguous and confusing the translator's non-Arabic-speaking readers. This concluding chapter, therefore, presents some of the key observations that have arisen from the comparative analysis of the three translations. It also gives a brief summary of the study's findings, and uses these to respond to the research questions posed in Chapter One. It follows this with a section that highlights the contribution of this research to the field of translation studies, and specifically to the quest to identify and reduce the particular problems associated with the translation of Quranic collocations. The chapter also points to the limitations of the study and offers some recommendations for further research on the subject.

7.2 The research findings

When this study analysed the translation of twenty Quranic collocations containing implicit meanings, it found that the translators did not adhere to a specific translation method or strategy when rendering these into English. For the most part, they found it difficult to grasp the culturally specific and metaphorical sense of the collocations, and consequently used a variety of different procedures. In total, the translations were accomplished using literal translation in twenty-nine instances, free translation in twenty-five, and semantic translation in six. Cultural borrowing was also used in two instances and paraphrase strategies in thirteen, as well as nine footnotes, two of which fail to convey the meaning accurately. In addition, a calque technique, followed by either footnotes or a paraphrase, was adopted eight times. Lastly, an explanatory note inserted in the text itself was used only three times. None of the translators succeeded in rendering all the samples of the selected collocations informatively to the target readership. The results of the study indicate that the most frequently used approach to rendering the implicit meaning of these culturally specific collocations was that

of literal translation, and they further reveal that this led to a significant loss of the intended meaning, distorting the entire translation.

The findings also confirm that the time in which the selected translations were produced affected their style. For example, the translations of Pickthall and Ali appear to be written in an archaic form of English. Moreover, it is important to note that their translations of the Quran were produced in the first half of the twentieth century: Pickthall's translation was first published in 1930, while Ali's was first published in 1934. These works, therefore, appeared in the period before translation studies first emerged in the second half of the twentieth century and began to develop systematic translation theories and methods. Pickthall's approach is the more literal, with word-for-word translation. In these examples, he uses this method eighteen times, and only once uses semantic and free translation methods. He also provides only one footnote and does not use of any other compensatory strategies. Neither does he refer to any of the Quranic exegeses to help him interpret the intended meaning of the collocations: as such, his approach to the translations is entirely source text-oriented. Ali, on the other hand, does not seem to have followed any specific method or strategy when rendering the implicit meanings of the selected collocations into English: sometimes, he uses literal translation; at others, he adopts semantic translation; and at still other times, he uses free translation. For example, he uses a literal translation method seven times, free translation nine times and semantic translation four times. He also adds footnotes seven times; however, two of these footnotes do not provide sufficient relevant information to justify the explanation he provides, as in the example of his translation of collocation (12) '*dāri s-salām*', referred to above. He also uses a calque technique five times, mainly followed by footnotes and once by a paraphrase. He thus appears to rely mainly on footnotes to explain his translation.

Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation approach, in contrast, appears to be mainly target text-oriented, and consequently adheres to the method of free translation, placing essential descriptive information in parentheses, footnotes or as a paraphrase. In the examples analysed in this study, they use a free translation method fifteen times, literal translation four times and semantic translation once. Al-Hilali's and Khan's translation was produced in the second half of the twentieth century – in 1974 – and may have benefited from contemporary academic studies of translation theory and methods, as their style appears modern and they use different procedures in their translation of the implicit meaning of the selected collocations. As such, they use a paraphrase technique thirteen times, a calque technique three times (elucidated by

paraphrasing), and adopt the use of footnotes twice. They also employ a cultural borrowing technique twice, although one of these instances is not explained to the target audience. Lastly, they use an explanatory note three times. Al-Hilali and Khan depend, for the most part, on exegetic materials to aid their translation, referencing works such as those by Bukhari and Muslim. However, their translation also includes a certain amount of redundancy as they insert explanatory information into the text and use long footnotes, with the result that they sometimes risk confusing target readers with the volume of information they provide. Although Al-Hilali, as a native Arabic speaker, was more aware of the language in which the Quran written, does not succed with Khan in conveying the implicit meaning of five collocations of the twenty selected samples, and this seems problematic. To sum up, all three translators use a mixture of different translation methods.

7.3 Responses to the research questions

The findings of the comparative analysis of twenty culturally specific and metaphorical collocations in the Quran provide answers to the research questions outlined in the introductory chapter, as seen below:

- Which translation methods and procedures can be used to obtain informative and effective translations of Quranic collocations?

The analysis has revealed that the most appropriate method to render the intended meaning of the collocations in the Quran into English is that of free translation. The most important characteristic of this approach is the focus on the text's implicit meanings and their effect, as well as on the intentions of the author. This method transfers the content of the original text into English, without paying much attention to its grammatical structure. The study has also shown that procedures such as paraphrasing, footnotes and the calque technique (used with descriptive equivalents, explanatory notes, shifts, additions and compensation) are effective methods for conveying the implicit meanings of collocations in the Quran in the target language.

- How effective is the free translation method in contextualising culturally specific collocations in the Quranic text?

This approach is not restricted by the number of words in the original text and therefore can interpret it in a more expansive way. As such, it is able to approximate the original meaning

of the source text, reducing translation loss and helping the target readers to grasp the deeper meanings of the collocations, rendering their message accessible. With this method, translators have the freedom to use different procedures in order to illuminate the ambiguous meanings found in Quranic collocations.

- What is the impact of adopting a literal translation method on the translation of culturally specific collocations in the Quran?

The research has shown that literal translation deforms the intended meaning of collocations and sometimes produces ambigious translations that could confuse target readers. This approach focuses on the form rather than the content of the text, and it restricts itself to transferring the surface of the words into the target language rather than the contextual message. The Quran contains deep, culturally specific and allegorical meanings embedded within it, and this approach may not succeed in conveying the implicit sense of the collocations effectively.

- How useful are the works of Quranic exegesis to translators when rendering Quranic collocations into English?

Quranic exegetical works enable translators to understand the intended meaning of a culturally specific or metaphorical collocation, allowing them to place such phrases in their religious, cultural, social and historical context. The exegeses also illuminate the meanings of the verses surrounding a particular collocation, enabling translators to grasp its implicit meaning by referring to the interpretation of these verses. In addition, the commentaries can illustrate and explain the reasons for the revelation contained in a surah, which is essential to an understanding of the intended meaning of the collocations found within it. This can help translators to decide which of the available translation methods and procedures they need to use. According to El-Maghazi (2004, 157), ‘referring to authentic commentaries is essential to achieve [an] accurate understanding of the source text and avoid the problems which face the translators in several instances’.

7.4 Translations related to a semantic and communicative translation theory

This section intends to shedlight on some translations of the selected translators that related to a semantic and communicatice translation theory suggeseted by Newmark (1988). In sample

(2), '*ahlal kitāb*' in surah 3: 64 (see Chapter Six), the comparative analysis has shown that Ali uses a literal translation: 'People of the Book!' This method, however, does not focus on the implicit meaning and simply transfers, as closely as possible, the grammatical structure of the source language into the target language. As a result, this translation may appear ambiguous to the target readers, who need to know who these 'people' are. Pickthall, instead, uses a semantic translation, 'People of the Scripture!', which conveys the intended meaning to some extent, but the 'people' referred to still need to be identified since the collocation could be misunderstood as referring solely to Christians. By contrast, Al-Hilali and Khan render the collocation '*ahlal kitāb*' accurately, using a free translation: 'people of the Scripture (Jews and Christians)'. They clarify that the phrase implies Jews and Christians. Al-Hilali and Khan's translation is related to the semantic and communicative translation theory suggested by Newmark (1988). As such, they use a semantic translation method, 'people of the Scripture', followed by acommunicative translation method, adding 'Jews and Christians'. The semantic and communicative translation methods when used together clarify the implicit meaning and convey the information in a way that is intelligible to the target audience. A semantic translation method on its own, as used by Pickthall, is not sufficient to produce an adequate translation since the meaning will still be unclear to the target readership. However, when the two methods are applied together in the translation process, the message is transferred approximately and clearly. Newmark (1988, 55) states that 'the semantic translation is required (to show the 'thought-processes' of the utterance)', whereas, 'the communicative translation may be preferable to make the utterance on the first reading more comprehensible and attractive'. Thus, a semantic translation focuses on the figurative meanings of the source text and the intention of the author while a communicative translation concentrates primarly on the target audience, making the message accessible.

The analysis of sample (11), '*dāri s-salām*', from surah 10: 25 (see Chapter Six), has shown that three translations again render the collocation in different ways. This may be attributed to the fact that the translators may have encountered difficulties in grasping its intended meaning. Al-Hilali and Khan render this collocation freely, with an explanation in parentheses: 'home of peace (i.e. Paradise, by accepting Allah's religion of Islamic Monotheism and by doing righteous good deeds and abstaining from polytheism and evil deeds)'. Their translation echoes the definition of paradise. Al-Hilali and Khan also add information referring to some of the actions that lead to paradise. On the other hand, Ali uses a calque translation, 'the Home of Peace', followed by a semantic translation with a footnote

which reads: ‘In contrast with the ephemeral and uncertain pleasures of this material life, there is a higher life to which God is always calling. It is called the Home of Peace. For there is no fear, nor disappointment, nor sorrow there.’ This explanation, however, fails to transfer the intended meaning – without reference to the word ‘paradise’ it could be understood as meaning a call by Allah to follow His path as laid down by Islam. Al-Hilali and Khan’s translation is related to the semantic and communicative translation theory advocated by Newmark (1988). As such, they use an explanatory note, referring to the intended meaning, ‘paradise’, which has been transferred communicatively to the target audience.

In this context, Newmark’s assertion that a semantic translation method should be used for works of religion, where form and content are fused, is appropriate since the translation needs to be more explicit. Newmark (1988, 53) gives the following example: a sentence such as ‘Mary was a virgin mother’ should be elucidated and the translator should also transfer the intention of the author. He recommends using a semantic translation method with sacred texts, but suggests the use of a communicative translation method as well, since the former method alone will not be sufficient to transmit the entire message to the target audience. He asserts that ‘semantic translation remains within the original culture and assists the reader only in its connotations’ (1988, 39) while a communicative translation, concentrated on the target reader, transfers foreign items into the target language in a more comprehensible way (1991). However, it can be noticed that Ali only uses the semantic translation method in a footnote, and despite the intensive information, the message remains ambigious.

7.5 Translations related to an exegetic translation method

This section will also highlight on some translations related to an exegetic translation method proposed by Dickins and his co-authors (2002). The study analysed sample (5), ‘*waʾātū az-zakāt*’, which appears in Surah Al-Baqarah (2: 43) (see Chapter Six), revealing that the translators render this collocation in different ways. Al-Hilali and Khan use a cultural borrowing technique (‘give *zakāt*’) without explanation. This technique is a useful tool to employ when there is no equivalent concept in the target language, but it also needs an explanation. Al-Hilali and Khan should have used other translation procedures to convey the implicit meaning. On the other hand, Ali uses a semantic translation method to translate this phrase as ‘practice regular charity’. As noted in Chapter Six, this method focuses the translator’s attention on the author and their intentions, and ignores the needs of the target

reader. As a consequence, it can fail to convey the original message with sufficient clarity to the non-Arabic-speaking reader.

Pickthall, however, produces an informative translation through his free translation of the collocation that renders its intended meaning successfully into English by using the phrase 'pay the poor-due', followed by an explanatory footnote. The free translation method that Pickthall uses manages to transfer the contextual meaning of the collocation, in contrast to Ali's semantic translation. The latter's translation does not serve its primary purpose of conveying the fact that *zakāt* is paid regularly as a specific form of charity. His translation could be understood by Arabic speakers or by non-Arabic speakers familiar with Islamic concepts but not by readers with no understanding of the context in which the collocation appears. Moreover, these readers might be led to believe that the term refers to any type of charity. Pickthall's translation is related to the exegetic translation method proposed by Dickins and his co-authors (2002), since he explains the Islamic cultural term '*waʾātū az-zakāt*' in a footnote, reducing significant meaning loss in the target language. Abdul-Raof (2001, 141) also recommends using footnotes in the translation of the Quran: 'the use of footnotes in the Quran translation is a useful and plausible translation option. Footnotes can be used as translation enforcements which have a significant added value to the communicative process of translation.' The exegetic translation method functions as a kind of compensation when specific terminologies implying important information have no equivalent in the target language. Dickins et al. (2002) assert that compensation is crucial to the production of a satisfactory translation. The exegetic translation method is therefore essential since it allows the target readers to access the useful information embedded in the Arabic linguistic structure.

The analysis of sample (6), which occurs in Surah Al-Imran (3: 107) (see Chapter Six), has shown that Pickthall does not consider the contextual meaning of the collocation '*lyaqḍū tafathahum*' (verb + noun) and thus renders the collocation literally as 'make an end of their unkemptness'. This translation does not convey the concept contained in the surah. As Chapter six explains, '*tafath*' is an unusual Arabic word, which some Arab lexicographers and exegetes translate as 'dirt'; in this context, however, it means shaving and cleansing the body (of dirt). Pickthall renders the original meaning literally as 'unkemptness' and does not consider the implicit meaning, allowing a serious translation loss. On the other hand, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali manage to convey the intended meaning through the use of free translation, with the addition of paraphrases such as '*Manâsik* of *Hajj*' and 'rites', followed

by footnotes. In this way, they are able to clarify the deeper meaning of the collocation, illustrating how a free-translation technique gives the translator the flexibility to adopt different strategies in order to convey the original message informatively to the target readership. El-Maghazi emphasises the importance of using strategies and techniques such as paraphrasing and footnotes to elucidate the intended meaning of difficult words in the Quran:

> When translating unknown concepts, paraphrasing or a descriptive phrase may express the meaning faithfully, or stress the components in focus in that context. In other words, the translator unpacks the components of the Qur'anic word, as there is no corresponding word in English to reflect such components. Footnotes can be used to add more clarity. They compensate for any loss in translating the source-text concepts. (El-Maghazi, 2004, 106)

Therefore, it appears that Ali's free translation and the translation of Al-Hilali and Khan both include the exegetic translation method proposed by Dickins et al (2002). As such, they illuminate in more detail the implicit meaning of the old Islamic term '*lyaqḍū tafathahum*', using footnotes to compensate for the loss in meaning during translation. Dickins et al. (2002, 49) call the compensation technique 'the reduction of an unacceptable translation loss through the calculated introduction of a less unacceptable one'. In this way, Al-Hilali and Khan, and Ali may have succeeded in reducing serious loss of meaning, making the message more explicit to the target readership. In short, as translation loss is unavoidable, the translator should take the decision to use a suitable technique which will help reduce this loss, at least to a certain degree, in order to ensure that the message can be understood in the target language. In the example above, the only technique that could be employed to minimise the loss as much as possible is a footnote, since this technique provides much-needed information about the term '*liyaqḍū tafathahum*'.

7.6 The contribution of the study

The comparative study of the three selected translations has revealed that the collocational phrases in the Quran represent a phenomenon that appears to prevent Quranic translators from producing informative and comprehensible translations.

This study, therefore, makes three main noteworthy contributions to the current literature. Firstly, it introduces in detail the methods and procedures employed by the selected translators in their attempts to convey the implicit meanings of the chosen Quranic collocations. Since the main aim of Quranic translation is to convey its meaning clearly to the

readership, this study is (to the best of my knowledge) the first to examine the translation of collocations in the Quran from the perspective of translation theory. It merges Newmark's (1988) semantic and communicative translation theory with Dickins et al. (2002) exegetic translation method and applies this to its analysis.

The second contribution is linked to the theoretical nature of this study, which means that it can act as a guide for future translators, helping them grasp the implicit meanings of Quranic collocations, reduce translation loss, and approximate and elucidate the message in the target language. Savory (1957, 52, cited in Abdel-Raof, 2001, 182) asserts that it is crucial that translators of the Quran have some knowledge of translation theories to enhance their interpretational awareness. Before undertaking their delicate task, they need to identify the nature of their translation, and whether it is going to be source text-oriented or target audience-oriented. If they decide on the latter, then the translator needs to produce an informative translation. In this case, semantic and communicative translation theory is very effective when applied to the task of conveying the intended meanings of collocations accurately into the target language. This method transfers the contextual meaning of the source language into the target language, and because of this, is able to produce the same effect. The exegetic translation method is also useful and informative in that exegeses can explain and elucidate the allegorical meanings of the Quranic collocations. This information can be placed, for example, in explanatory footnotes, particularly when a certain amount of important information is needed to explain the meaning of the collocation. As El-Maghazy emphasises:

> [R]eflecting the Quranic message accurately can be achieved in several instances by rendering the sense in focus in descriptive phrases in a readable clear style; the use of footnotes for clarification of ambiguity; and by avoiding adherence to the source-text structures, which greatly limits expressing the message. In other words, exegetical translation proves to be more successful in communicating the message of the Quran faithfully. (El-Maghazy, 2004, 158)

The third contribution of the present study is that it has discovered a number of culturally specific collocations in the Quran that include deeper meanings, and suggested an interpretation of their grammatical patterns according to their specific combinations of words.

7.7 The limitations of the study

The current study has investigated the problems of rendering culturally specific collocations in the Quran into English, and has shown that literal translation sometimes deforms the sense of a collocation and free translation is thus a more suitable approach for a translator to adopt. However, due to the limitations of time inherent to thesis-based research, it has selected only three translations to examine in its comparative analysis. Another shortcoming is the fact that, once again due to the constraints of time, the study has collected just twenty samples of Quranic collocations and consulted four exegetical works to aid in the recognition of the advantages and disadvantages of the different methods adopted by the authors of these three translations. A wider analysis is required to verify its results.

7.8 Recommendations for further research

This study has not highlighted all the culturally specific collocations that occur in the Quran; therefore, further research is needed for an in-depth analysis of other such collocations. Such research would enhance the findings of the current study and further clarify the difficulties encountered by translators in rendering this type of Quranic collocation into a target language. The current study has suggested some procedures and strategies as a guide to future translators who wish to overcome the problems they face when translating collocations that include culturally specific and metaphorical meanings, but further research is needed to test these proposed procedures and to explore if they are suitable for translating the Quranic collocations, or whether better methods can be found.

Finally, since the issues that arise in relation to the translation of the Quran can be traced to the weaknesses of individual works, this study recommends the establishment of an international institute dedicated to the project of translating the Quran. The institute should contain a number of different committees consisting of specialists in Quranic exegesis, in the Arabic language, in foreign languages, and in translation. These committees should then collaborate to produce a good translation of the Quran in English, as well as in other languages.

Bibliography

Abdel-Haleem, M. (2004). *The Qur'an: A New Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Abdel-Haleem, M (1999). *Understanding the Quran: Themes and Style*. London: I.B.Tauris.

Abdel-Rahim, A. (1981). *Lughat Al-Quran Al-Kharīm*. Amman: Maktabat Al-Resalah Al-Hadīthah.

Abdelwali, M. (2007). 'The loss in the translation of the Quran'. *Translation Journal,* 11 (2), 1-12.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2001). *Quran translation: Discourse, Texture and Exegesis*. London: Routledge.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2001). *Arabic Stylistics: A Course Book*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlago.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2003). *Exploring the Quran*. Dundee: Al-Maktoum Institute Academic Press.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2004). 'The Quran: Limits of Translatability'. In Faiq, S (ed), *Cultural Encounters in Translation from Arabic*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp. 91-106.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2005). "Cultural Aspects in Quran Translation", in Long, L. (ed.) *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?* Clevendon. Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp.162-172.

Abdul-Raof, H. (2006). *Arabic Rhetoric: A pragmatic analysis*. London: Routledge.

Ahmed, Z. (2012). *English lexical collocation knowledge of Libyan university students,* doctoral thesis, Bangor University.

Al-Azzam, B, Al-Ahaydib, M, and Al-Huqail, E. (2015). 'Cultural Problems in the translation of the Quran'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation*, 1 (2), 28-34.

Al-Dahabi, S. (1996). *Sīr Aʿlām Al-Nubalā.* Beirut. Al-Resālah.

Al-Dahabi, M. (2012). *The Interpreting and the Interpreters (vol.1)*. Cairo: Dar Al-Hadith.

Al-Dahesh, A. (2014).'(Un) translatability of the Quran: A theoretical perspective'. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 6 (6), 23-45.

Al-Dagar, A. (1999). *Ahmed Ibn Hanbel: Imam Ahl Al-Sunnah* (fourth edition). Damascus. Dar Al-Qalam.

Al-Dali, M. (1997). *Al-Kāmel* (second edition). Beirut. Al-Resalah

Al-Dāmaghany, *A. (1983). Al-Wujūh wa al-naẓāᵓir li alfāẓ kitāb Allāh al-ᶜazīz.* (ed.) by: Alī, A. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ᶜIlmiyyaẗ.

Al-Fawzan, M. (2002). *Which Book Should Be Firstly Translated: Translation of the the meaning of Holy Qur'an or Translation of the scholars' Interpretation of the Quran?* Madina: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an.

Al-Ghamdi, S. (2015).*Critical and Comparative Evaluation of the English Translations of the Near-Synonymous Divine Names in the Qurān*, doctoral thesis, University of Leeds.

Al-Hafiz, A. (2004).*Al-Hafiz Arabic Collocations Dictionary (AACD) (Arabic-English).* Beirut: Libraire du Liban Publishers.

Al-Hilali, M. T. and Khan, M. M. (1996). *Translation of the Meanings of the Noble Qur'an in the English Language*. Riyadh: King Fahad Complex for the Printing of the Holy Qur'an.

Ali, A.Y. (1975). *The Glorious Quran: Translation and Commentary*. Newyork: The Muslim Students Association.

Ali, A., Brakhw, M., Nordin, M., Ismail, S. (2012). 'Some Linguistic Difficulties in translating the Holy Quran from Arabic into English'. *International Journal of Social science and Humanity*, 2 (6), 588-590.

Al-Jabari, R. (2008). *Reasons for the possible incomprehensibility of some verses of three translations of the meaning of the Holy Quran into English*, doctoral thesis, Unversity of Salford.

Al-Khatib, A. (2010). 'Abdullah Yusuf Ali: A study of His life and Translation'. *Journal of Quranic Studies*, 11 (1), 169-198.

Al-Khawalda, M. (2004). 'The Deterioration of the usage of *kaana* in the Holy Quran via Translation'. *Babel*, 50 (3), 215-229.

Al-Mahali, J., and Al-Suyūṭī, J. (2004). *Tafsīr Al-Jalālayn*. Beirut: Dar Al-Kutb Alʿālamiah.

Al-Malik, F. (1995). *Performative Utterances: Their Basic and Secondary Meanings with Reference to Five English Translations of the Meanings of the Holy Quran*, doctoral thesis, University of Durham.

Almisned, O. (2001). *Metaphor in the Quran: An assessment of three English translations of Suurat Al-Hajj*, doctoral thesis, University of Durham.

Al-Qattan, M. (1990). *Mabahith fi Ulum Al-Qur'an*. Cairo: Maktabat Wahbah.

Al-Qurtubi, M. (2006). *Al-Jāma' Li Ahkām Al-Quran*.Beirut: Al-Resalah Corporation.

Al-Razi, M. (1995). *Tafsīr Al-Kabīr wa Muftāh Alghīb.*Beruit. Dar-Alfiker.

Al-Salem, R. (2008).*Translation of Metonymy in the Holy Qur'an: A Comparative, Analytical Study*, doctoral thesis, King Saʿūd University.

Alshaje'a, H. (2014). 'Issues in translating collocations of the Holy Quran'. *Language in India*, 14 (8), 49-65.

Al-Sofi, K., Maros, M. and Abu Baker, K. (2014). 'Quranic collocations: A problem in translation'. *Quranica: International Journal of Quranic Research*, 6 (2), 39-50.

Al-Tha'alibi, A. (1998). *Philology and Secrets of the Arabic Language. Cairo:* Al-Khanji liberary.

Al-Tabari, A. (1997). *Tafsīr Al-Ṭabarī*. Beirut: Dar Al-Shamiah.

Alᶜ Ubayd, A. S. (2002). *Tarjamat al-qurān al-karīm: Hagīgataha wa hukmaha*. Al-Madina Al-Munawarah: King Fahd Complex for Printing of the Holy Quran.

Al-Zuhair, A. (2008). *Al-Nāsikh and Al-Minsūk in The Quran.*Riyadh. Dar Ibn-Al-Qīʾm.

Anari, S. and Sanjarani. A. (2016). 'Application of Baker's Model in Translating Quran Specific Cultural Items'. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, 4 (3), 145-151.

Ansari, K. (2017). 'Pickthall, Muslims of South Asia, and the British Muslim Community of the early 1900's'. In Nash, G (ed), *Marmaduke Pickthall: Islam and The Modern World.* Leiden: Brill, pp.23-46.

Arberry, A. (1980). *The Quran Interpreted. London*. Gerorge Allen and Unwin.

Asad. M. (2008). *The message of the Quran*. London: The Book Foundation.

Badawi, E. and Abdel-Haleem, M (2008).*Arabic-English Dictionary of Quranic Usage.* Leiden: Brill.

Baharuddin, N., Ahmed, H., Abd-Rahman, S., and Baharun, H. (2018). 'Fakhr Al-Din Al-Razi: A systematic Review on Literature Found in Indonesia'. *International Journal of IJCIET,* 9, (5), 705-714.

Bahns, J. (1993). 'Lexical collocations: A contrastive view', *ELT Journal*, 47 (1), 56-63.

Bahumaid, S. (2006).'Collocation in English-Arabic Translation'. *International Journal of Translation,* 52 (2), 133-152.

Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words.* 1st ed., London: Routledge.

Baker, M. (2011). *In Other Words*. 2nd ed., London: Routledge.

Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words*. 3nd ed., London: Routledge.

Baker, M. and Hannah, S. (2009). Arabic Tradition. In Baker, M., and Saldanha, G., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies.*Second edition. New York: Routledge, pp.328-337.

Barnbrook, G., Mason, O. and Krishnamurthy, R. (2013). *Collocation: applications and implications.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bartsch, S. (2004). *Structural and Functional Properties of Collocations in English: A corpus Study of Lexical and Pragmatic Constraints on Lexical Co-occurrence*. Tübingen: Narr.

Bassnett, S. (1980). *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.

Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies.* London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation Studies.*London: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation*. Abingdon. Routledge.

Beekman, J. and Callow, J. (1974). *Translating the word of God with Scripture and Tropical Indexes*. Michigan: Zondervan publishing.

Benjamin, W. (2000). 'The task of the Translator'. In Venuti, L (ed). *The Translation studies reader*. London and Newyork: Routledge,pp. 15-25.

Benson, M. (1985). Collocations and Idioms. In R. F. Ilson (ed.), *Dictionaries, Lexicography and Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon, pp.61-66.

Brashi, A. (2005). *Arabic collocations: Implications for translation*, doctoral thesis, University of Western Sydney.

Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistics Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (1988). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. New York: Longman.

Catford, J. C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Ceylan, Y. (1980). *Theology and Tafsīr in the majour works of Fakhr Al-Dīn Al-Rāz ī,* doctorl thesis, University of Edinburgh.

Chesterman, A. (1997). *Memes of Translation*. London: Benjamins.

Chesterman, A. (2017). Reflections on the literal translation hypothesis. In Chesterman, A (ed), *Reflections on Translation Theory (Selected Papers 1993-2014).*Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 237-249.

Che Suh, J. (2005). *A study of translation strategies in Guilaume Oyono MBIA's plays*, doctoral thesis, University of South Africa.

Clark, P. (2017). 'Forward: Pickthall after 1936'. In Nash, G) (ed), *Marmaduke Pickthall: Islam and The Modern World*. Lieden: Brill, pp.vii-xiii.

Cowie, A. (1981). 'The treatment of collocations and idioms in learners' dictionaries'. *Applied Linguistics,* 2(3), 223-235.

Cowie, A. P. (1998). *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cruse, D. (1986). *Lexical Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De León, C. (2008), 'Skopos and beyond: A critical study of functionalism'. *Target*, 20(1), 1–28.

Dickins, J., Hervey, S. and Higgins, I. (2002). *Thinking Arabic Translation: A Course in Translation Method: Arabic to English*. London: Routledge.

Dickins, J. (2010). 'Junction in English and Arabic: Syntactic, Discoursal and Denotative features'. *Journal of Pragmatics,* 42(4), 1076-1136.

Dwiek, B. and Abu Shakra, M. (2011). 'Problems in translating collocations in religious texts from Arabic into English'. *The Linguistic Journal,* 5 (1), 5-41.

El-Gemei, D. (2006). "Collocation", in Versteegh, K. *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics,* Vol. 1, Boston: Brill, pp.434-439.

Elimam, A. (2009). *Clause-level Foregrounding in the the translation of the Quran into English: Patterns and Motivations*, doctoral thesis, University of Manchester.

El-Magazy, R. (2004). *An analytical study of translating the Quran: Comparative analysis of nine English Translations of Surah Al-An'Am*, doctoral thesis, University of Portsmouth.

Emery, P. (1991).'Collocations in Modern Standard Arabic'. *Journal of Arabic Linguistics,* 23 (1), 56-65.

Esack, F. (1993). 'Quranic Hermeneutics: Problems and Porspects'.*The Muslim World*, 83 (2), 118-141.

Farghal, M. and Al-Masri, M. (2000). "Reader Responses in Quranic Translation", *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology,* 8 (1), 27-46.

Fass, D. (1997). *Processing Metonymy and Meta*phor. Greenwich: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Fawcett, P. and Munday, J. (2009). Ideology. In Baker, M., and Saldanha, G.,(ed), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London: Routledge, pp.137-141.

Firth, J. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Ghalal, M. (2015). 'Lost in collocation: When Arabic collocation dictionaries lack collocations'. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies,* 5(2), 18-38.

Ghazala, H. (2007). *Dar El-ilm's Dictionary of Collocations (English-Arabic).* Beirut: Dar El-Ilm.

Ghazala, H. (2014). *Translating Islamic Texts: A Text Book*. Jeddah. Maktabat Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah.

Gitsaki, C. (1999). *Second Language Lexical Acquisition: A Study of the Development of Collocational Knowledge*. Bethesda, MD: International Scholars Publications.

Green, B. (2012).*Askopos-based analysis of Breytenbach's Titus Andronicus*. MPhil thesis, Stellenbosch University.

Guillaume, A. (1990). *Islam*. London. Penguin Books.

Halliday, M. (1966). 'Lexis as a Linguistic Level'. In C. Bazell, J. Catford, M. Halliday& R. Robins (eds.), *In Memory of J.R. Firth* .London: Longman, pp.148- 162.

Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B. and Munday, J. (2004). *Translation: An advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge,

Hatim, B. (1997). *English-Arabic/Arabic-English Translation*. London: Saqi.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I. (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (2005). *The translator as communicator*. London: Routledge.

Hawamedh, M. and Kadhim, K. (2015). 'Parenthetical cohesive explicitness: Alinguistic Appraoch for a Modified Translation of the Quranic text'. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4 (5), 161-169.

Healey, A., Healey, P., and Deibler, E. (1998). *Doing Semantics*. Dallas: South Pacific Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Herman, M. (1993). 'In Scientific and Technical Translation' in Wright, S., and Wright Jr, L (eds), *Technical Translation Style*. Amestrdam: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 11-19.

Ibn Al-Jawzy, A. (1987). *Nuzhat al-aᶜyun al-nawāẓir fī ᶜilm al-wujūh wa al-naẓāᵓir*, (ed.) by: Muḥammad al-Rāḍy. Beirut: Muᵓassasat Al- Risālah.

Ibn Hishām, A. (1996). *The Biography of Prophet PBUH* .Cairo: Dar Al-Hadith.

Ibn Kathīr, I. (1997).*Tafsīr Al-Quran Al-Aẓīm*. Beirut. Dar Ahia Al-Turat Al-Arabi.

Ibn Kutaībah, A. (1981). *Taʾwīl Mushkal Al-Quran*. Al-Madinah: Al-Maktabah Al-ʿilmiah

Ibn Manzur, M. (1955). *Dictionary of Lisān Al-Arab* (vol.2). Beirut: Dar Sader and Dar Beirut.

Ibn-Taimiya, T. (1997).*Muqadimāt fī usūl al-Tafsīr- Introduction in the science of tafsīr)*. Riyadh. Dar Al-Mu'id.

Ibn-Taimiya, T. (2001). *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*. Al-Manṣourah: Dār al-Wafa

Iqbal, M. (2000). 'Abdullah Yusuf Ali and Mohammed Asad: Two Approaches to the English Translation of the Quran'. *Journal of Quranic studies*, 2 (1), 107-123.

Irving, T. (1985). *The Quran: The First American Version*. Brattleboro. Amana Books.

Izwaini, S. (2016). 'The translation of Arabic Lexical Collocations'.*Translation and Interpreting studies,* 11 (2), 306-328.

Jaber, J. (2006). 'Skopos Theory: Basic Princinples and Deficiencies'. *Journal of the College of Arts,* 4 (1), 37-46.

Jackobson, R. (2012). On Linguistic Aspects of Translation. In Venuti, L (ed), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd). London: Routledge, pp.126-131.

Jabak, O., Abdullah, S., and Mustapha, N., (2016).'The Difficulty of Translating Collocations from Arabic into English Encountered by a Sample of Arabic Students'. *JSASS,* 3(1), 266-275.

Jassem, Z. (2014). The Noble Quran: A critical Evaluation of Al-Hilali and Khan's Translation. *International Journal of English and Education*, 3 (2), 237-273.

Khaleel, M. (2005). 'Assessing English Translations of the Quran'. *Journal of the Middle East Quarterly,* 12(2), 58-71.

Khosravi, H., and Mohammadi, M., (2016). 'Influence of Translator's Religious Ideology on Translation: A case Study of English Translation of the Noble Quran'. *International Journal of English language and Translation Studies.* 4 (4), 151-163.-

Kidwai, A. (1987). Translating the Untranslatable: A survey of English Translation of Quran. *The Muslim World Book Review, 7*(4), 66-71.

Kidwai, A. (2007) *Bibliography of the translations of the meanings of the Glorious Quran into English, 1649- 2002: Acritical study*. Al-Madinah: King Fahd printing.

Kidwai, A. (2017). 'Muhammad Marmaduke Pickthall's English Translation of the Quran (1930): An Assessment'. In Nash, G., *Marmaduke Pickthall: Islam and The Modern World*. Leiden: Brill, pp.231-247.

Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lakoff, G., and Johnsen, M., (2003) *Metaphors we live by*. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Larson, M. (1984). *Meaning-Based Translation*.California: University Press of America.

Larson, M. (1998). *Meaning-Based Translation*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Leech, G. (1974). *Semantics: The study of meaning.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Lehrer, A. (1974). *Semantics Fields and Lexical Structure*. London: North Holland publishing company.

Lefevere, A. (2003). 'The Role of Ideology in the Shaping of a Translation'. In Lefevere, A. (ed), *Translation, History, Culture: A Source Book*. London: Routledge, pp.14-18.

Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture Bumps: An Empirical Appraoch to the Translation of Allusions*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Loimeier, R. (2005). 'Translating the Qur'an in Sub-Saharan Africa: Dynamics and Disputes'. *Journal of Religion in Africa,* 35(4), 403-423.

Long, L. (2005), Introduction: Translating Holy Texts. In Long. L, (ed), *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?* Clevendon: Multilingual Matters Ltd, pp.1-15.

Lyons, J. (1966). "Firth's theory of meaning". In Bazell, C., Catford. J., Halliday, M. and Robins, R. (eds.), *In memory of J. R. Firth.* London: Longman, pp. 288-302.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*, vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*, vol.2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macis, M., and Schmitt, N., (2017). 'The figurative and Polysemous Nature of Collocations and their Place'. *ELT journal,* 71 (1), 50-59.

Martin, R. (1982). 'Understanding the Quran in Text and Context'. *History of Religions*, 21 (4), 361-384.

Mattew, B., and Rozz, L., (2010). *Research Methods: A Practical Guide for the Social Sciences*. London: Longman.

Mirza, Y. (2014) 'Was Ibn Kathir Spokesperson for IbnTaymiyya? Jonah as a Prophet of Obedience'. *Journal of Quranic Studies*, 16 (1), 1-19.

Mitchell, T. (1971). 'Linguistic 'Goings on': Collocations and other Lexical Matters Arising on the Syntagmatic Record'. *Archivum Linguisticum*, 2(1), 35-69

Munday, J. (2001). *Introduction to Translation Studies: Theories and Applications.* London: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2012). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Application*s. London: Routledge.

Najjar, S. (2012). *Metaphors in translation: An investigation of a sample of Quran metaphors with reference to three English versions of the Quran, doctoral thesis,* University of Liverpool John Moores.

Naser, S., Dagli, C., Dakake, M., Lumbard, J., and Ruston, M., (2015). *The study Quran*. *A new translation and Commentary* .Newyork: HarperOne.

Nash, G. (2017). Introduction: Pickthall Islam and Modern world. In Nash, G (ed), *Marmaduke Pickthall: Islam and The Modern World*. Lieden: Brill,pp. 1-20.

Nassimi, D. (2008). *Athematic Comparative Review of Some English Translations of the Quran*, doctoral thesis, Birmingham University.

Newmark,P.(1988). *Approaches to Translation.*Hempstead: PrenticeHall International Ltd.

Newmark, P. (1995). *A Textbook of Translation*. London: Phoenix ELT.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation.* Sydney: Multilingual Matters.

Newmark, P. (1998). *More Paragraphs on Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Newmark, Peter (2000). The Deficiencies of Skopos Theory: A Response to Anna Trosborg. *Current Issues in Language & Society*, 7(3), 259-260.

Nida, E. (1964). *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E., & Taber, C. R., (1982). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. and Taber, C. (2003). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.

Nida, E. (2001). *Context in translating*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Nida.E. (1994). 'Translation: Possible and impossible'. *In Turjuman*, 3 (2), 147-163.

Nida, E. (2003). *Toward A Science of Translation: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating.* Second impression. Leiden: Brill.

Nofal, K. (2012). 'Collocations in English and Arabic: A comparative study'. *Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, (2)3, 75-93.

Obana, Y. (1993). "The Linguistic Significant of Lexical Items". *META*, 38(3), 491-501.

Omar, A. (2008). *Dictionary of Contemporary Arabic Language*. Cairo: Alim Al-Kutub.

Palmer, F. (1981). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pickthall, M. (1938). *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*: *Text and Explanatory Translation*. vol I. Hyderabad: Government Center Press.

Pickthall, M. (1938). *The Meaning of the Glorious Quran*: *Text and Explanatory Translation*. Vol II. Hyderabad: Government Center Press.

Philips, A. (2005). *Uṣūl at-Tafsīr: The Methodology of Quranic Interpretation.* Riyadh: International Islamic Publishing House.

Pym, A. (2014). *Exploring Translation Theories*. London: Routledge.

Qadhi, Y. (1999). *An introduction of the Sciences of the Quran*. Birmingham: Al-Hidaayah Publishing and Distribution.

Quli, A. (2005). *The Quran With a Phrase by Phrase English Translation*. London. Islamic College for Advance Studies Press.

Rippin, A. (2004). *Review of Fakhry, Majid, 'an Interpretation of the Qur'an: English Translation of the Meanings' and Haleem, M. A. S. Abdel,'The Qur'an: ANew Translation*.H-Mideast-Medieval,H-NetReviews.Availableonlinefrom:http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=10080.

Robins, R. (1964). *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. London: Longman.

Robinson, N. (2003) *Discovering the Qur'an*: *A Contemporary Approach to a Veild Text.* London: SCM Press.

Sadiq, S. (2010). *Acomparative study of four English Translations of Surat Ad-Dukhan on the Semantic level*. Newcastle. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Sambo, A. (2015). 'The Methods of Research Used By Ibn Jarir Al-Ṭabarī in His Qur"anic Exegesis'. *International Conference on Humanities, Literature and Management* (ICHLM'15) Jan. 9-10, 2015.

Sandomirskaya, I., and Oparina E., (1996). 'Russian Restricted Collocations: an Attempt at Frame Approach'. In *Proceedings of EURALEX (part 1)*, 273- 282.

Schäffnerr. C. (1998). 'Skopos Theory'. In Baker. M (ed.*), Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 235-238

Shah, M (2010) A Critical Study of Abdel-Haleem's New Translation of the Holy Qur'an. *UOC Journal, GC University,* 3-14, pp. 3-14.

Shakir, A., & Farghal, M., (1992). 'Collocations as an Index of L2 Competence in Arabic-English Simultaneous Interpreting & Translation'. *FIT-newsletter,* 11(3), 227-245.

Shastri, P. (2012). '*Fundamental Aspects of Translation*.' New Delhi: Asoke.

Sherif, M. (1994). *Searching for Solace: A Biography of Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Interpreter of the Quran*. Kuala Lumpur. Islamic Book Trust.

Shunnaq, A. (1998). Problems in Translating Arabic Text into English. In Shunnaq, A., Dollerup, C., and Sarairah, M., (eds). *Issues in Translation*. Amman: National Liberary, pp.33-52.

Sinclair, J. (1966). 'Beginning the Study of Lexis'. In C. Bazell, J. Catford, M. Halliday & R. Robins (eds.), *In Memory of J.R*. Firth. London: Longman. pp. 410-430.

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus Concordance Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smadja, F., Mckeown, K., and Hatzivassilolou, V., (1996) 'Translating Collocations for Bilingual Lexicon: A statistical Approach'. *Association for Computational Linguistics,* 2 (1), 1-38-

Suh, J. C. (2005). A Study of Translation Strategies in Guillaume Oyono MBIA' S Plays, doctoral thesis, University of South Africa.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Toury, G. (1980*).In Search of a Theory of Translation.* Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University.

Trisnawati, I. (2014). Skopos Theory: A practical Approach in the Translation Process. *Englisia,* 1 (2), 245-255.

Turner, C. (2013). *The Quran: Anew Interpretation*. London. Routledge.

Ushama, T. (1995). *Methodologies of Quran Exegesis*. Kuala Lumpur: Noordeen

Vasalou, S. (2002). 'The Miraculous Eloquence of the Quran: General Trajectories and Individual Appraoches'. *Journal of Quranic Studies,* 4(2), 23-53.

Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Vinay, J. P. and Darbelnet, J. (1995). *Comparative stylistics of French and English.*

A methodology for translation. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Von Denffer, A. (1994). *Ulum al-Quran: An Introduction to the Science of the Quran.* Leicestershire: The Islamic Foundation.

Williams, J. (2013). *Theories of Translation*.London: Palgrave Macmillan.